THEOLOGY

VOL. XXXIX AUGUST, 1939 No. 230

EDITORIAL

THEOLOGICAL and ecclesiastical labels are convenient and for certain purposes even indispensable; but it is questionable whether their use does not result in more evil than good, as is the case with some other indispensable things. They are indispensable, because we must have some means of classifying opinions, persons and institutions. In every such classification, however, there is an element of abstraction and therefore of potential error. A, B and C, you say, are all Socialists; that may be a significant and a true proposition. But, having affixed the label, you will at once be disposed to ascribe to them a far greater degree of unanimity than is likely to exist. Labelling is thus a frequent cause of erroneous inference and of injustice to persons; but how easy and agreeable it is! X is a Barthian, Y is a Modernist, Z is a Scholastic. It is most satisfactory to have "got them taped"; there is no further need now for careful and conscientious discrimination. No further need—until perhaps we pass beyond hearsay or reputation, and read their full writings for ourselves or meet them in the flesh and talk to them, and then how often the real person belies the label that convention or rumour has affixed! Some labellers, however, are not at all disconcerted even by this discovery. The person labelled must not be allowed to have a mind of his own. If he denies that he holds the opinions that hearsay or convention assigns to him, he is being disingenuous or dishonest or displaying a deplorable ignorance of the position which he is bound by his label to occupy.

* * * * *

Nevertheless, although they are so common a source of injustice and confusion and so tempting an encouragement to slovenly thinking and to mendacious and malicious gossip, labels remain indispensable. How can those who recognize the ease and the extent of the abuse be on their guard?

It is profitable to press both upon ourselves and upon others a scrupulously exact definition of terms. Let us, for example, examine the use of the term "Catholic"; we may find occasion in future to examine the use of other terms.

"The word (wrote Hort) is habitually used in three different senses besides its literal original meaning 'universal.' First, we speak of a catholic spirit, meaning one of wide and far-reaching sympathies, willing to hold converse with others very different from ourselves. Secondly, there is the stricter theological sense of belonging to the one undivided Church of different countries and perhaps different times. Thirdly, Romanists claim the title exclusively for those Churches which obey the Roman See, and for convenience they are often called merely Catholics in ordinary conversation."[1]

But this analysis is by no means exhaustive. Hort's second sense of the word, which he said was the only legitimate theological sense and which we shall call here the primary sense, is that of the creed: "I believe in the holy Catholic Church." Here "Catholic" signifies the Great Church as distinguished from schismatic sects, orthodoxy over against heresy, the complete over against the partial. All Churches which use the creed manifestly claim to be Catholic Churches in this sense, although complications arise when we begin to compare the grounds on which they justify their claim. But the claim itself is made quite as surely by the Church of England and by the Church of Scotland as it is by the Church of Rome. In this sense *The form of a Prayer to be used by all Preachers before their Sermons* in Canon 55 of the Canons of 1604 prescribes that "Ye shall pray for Christ's holy Catholic Church, . . . and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland." Catholicity thus defined is the attribute of a true Church, and of the members of a true Church because they are members, not because as individuals they subscribe to certain beliefs and conform to certain practices which can be differentiated from the general belief and practice of the Church to which they belong, still less because they have attached themselves to a party or sect within the Church which maintains a system of belief and practice different from that of the whole.

* * * * *

[1] See A. F. Hort, *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort* (1896), i. 462 *f.*

Yet it is with this latter implication that the word " Catholic " is often used today, whether as a term of approval or of disapproval. This is a sense of the word which Hort's analysis did not take into account; it is the sense in which the word " Catholic " is used as the opposite, and not as the complement, of Protestant, and which we shall call here its secondary sense. It is evident that in the primary, credal sense there is no inconsistency between Catholic and Protestant. Protestantism, historically understood, does not protest against the Catholic Church, but against the specific claims of the Church of Rome; so that the historical antithesis of Protestant is Papist, not Catholic. No instructed Protestant or Evangelical will deny his title to the use of the word " Catholic " in its application to the Church to which he belongs. But it has to be recognized that there is another sense in which the words " Catholic " and " Protestant " are antithetical, and we do not know that the theological legitimacy of this can be disallowed, provided it is clearly distinguished from the primary meaning.

* * * * *

Since the Reformation Western Christendom has been divided into two broadly distinguishable types of Christianity. One of these is described as Catholic, the other as Protestant or Evangelical. The difference between them is more easily detected or imagined than defined. It may be said to correspond to the distinction between the priestly and prophetic types of religion. The one stresses the ministry of the sacraments, the other that of the word. The distinction between authority and freedom, between the corporate and the personal, between richly clothed complexity and naked simplicity—each of these distinctions is suggestive of the difference; yet each, when pressed, is seen to be an oversimplification. After all, Catholicism and Protestantism are both forms of Christianity, and it is not surprising that they have much in common and that they cannot be so defined as absolutely to exclude one another. They cannot be so defined in the abstract, nor ought they to be so separated in the concrete. The disaster of a divided Christendom has issued in the attempt to achieve a static unity by exclusion and segregation instead of the dynamic unity which can be fully received only when the antithetical emphases of Catholicism and Protestantism are in close tension and the

dialectic between them is being worked out. Many individuals throughout Christendom are coming nowadays to see that this is so, and in this fact lies a better, if more distant, hope of a reunited Church than in projects for immediate ecclesiastical federation. The present situation is illustrated on the one hand by the emergence in more or less Protestant Churches of emphatic Catholic movements or tendencies and on the other hand by the remarkable understanding and appreciation of the specific witness and genius of Protestantism that is being shown by a growing number of Roman Catholic theologians.

* * * * *

In consequence, it is becoming increasingly difficult to use the word "Catholic," in its secondary sense, with precision, and it is losing much of its utility as a label. In any case it may be suggested that its common use among Anglicans is open to grave objection; confusion is widespread between the primary and secondary senses. Those Anglicans who call themselves Catholics,[1] thereby discriminating themselves from many or most of their fellow churchmen, are using the word in its secondary sense, but they easily suppose that it has the same force as when used in the expressions "the Catholic Church" and "the Catholic Faith." Have we not heard remarks such as these?—"Most of the people attending this church are Catholics." "I am glad (or sorry) to say that our new vicar is a Catholic." In each case the title is given because of the individual or party opinions or practices of the persons concerned. This usage will seem a sorry debasement of the term to those who appreciate the grand fact that the Catholic title in its primary sense is given to a child by the grace of God in baptism, and to a priest in holy orders, and not because they can lay claim to peculiarly correct opinions or to peculiarly virtuous practices.

* * * * *

For this reason we should be inclined to advocate a recovery of the use of the terms "high churchman," "low

[1] Or "Anglo-Catholics." The same confusion surrounds this term. Originally applied to the Church of England as a whole (primary sense), it is now applied to a party within the Church (secondary sense). Cp. A. S. Duncan-Jones in *Northern Catholicism* (1933), p. 461.

churchman," and "broad churchman," in so far as it is desirable to mark distinctions between Anglicans. We should be inclined to do this, if all these distinctions were not in the melting pot—*i.e.*, if the most significant distinctions between Christians today did not cut across all the labels that convention still affixes. The terms formerly in use had the singular merit of plainly asserting that all those to whom they were applied had in common the divine gift of churchmanship which must always put in the background our human apprehensions of the various meanings that the gift includes. The terms marked no doubt distinctions that were important, but the distinctions were subordinate to a unity which preceded and transcended them. Even as things are, we shall prefer the use of these terms to those by which they have been recently—and, as we must needs think, unfortunately—superseded in certain quarters. At all events we would urge that it is no mere fastidiousness or pedantry which prompts us to examine the ambiguity that lies concealed in the word "Catholic." Essential theological principles are involved in the matter. While it is not for us to lay down the law as to the use of labels, it seems clear that a fresh scrutiny of the use of this particular label will not be otiose. We need hardly add that, in the title of the third article in this number, the word is used in its primary sense.

Should a State be Neutral in Regard to Religion?

In all countries in our day organized religion is at a discount, and it appears increasingly anomalous that there should be an established Church and that the State should thus claim to be Christian. It may be doubted whether in any of the larger countries as much as half the population is actively connected with organized religion. The obvious deduction appears to be that the Church should be disestablished, and so this farcical pretence of a Christian State should be ended. Let each person have the religion he likes, and let the State not concern itself with religious matters. The Church can have its own sphere and not enter into politics. The first Free Churchmen, in the seventeenth century, claimed that a man's religion was no concern of the State, and indeed made no difference to it. And there is now no State which does not, at least in theory, grant freedom of conscience to profess any religion; even Russia, Germany, Italy and Japan do this, though this religious freedom does not necessarily extend to freedom of propagating one's religion.

The question is, of course, one that concerns other countries as much as England, and a study of the relations between Church and State in different countries, as seen for example in Dr Adolf Keller's fascinating book *Church and State on the European Continent*, is of absorbing interest and should be of great profit to those concerned with the question in England. Dr Keller shows what astonishingly varied forms a connexion between Church and State can take, and hints at some of the drawbacks which experience has shown to result from separation or disestablishment.

In many Continental countries the Church is subsidized by the State. In Lutheran countries the State collects the Church tax, but those who do not wish to do so need not pay it. In some parts, a State subsidy is granted in lieu of church property confiscated in the past. In Roman Catholic countries like Belgium and Austria, the Protestant Church also was subsidized by the State. In a number of countries, the State maintains theological faculties in the universities. The State maintains an evangelical theological faculty at the University of Vienna. The purest form of State Church now is in the Scandinavian countries. In

Denmark some churchpeople want a Church constitution as protection against State control; others abhor it, seeing in the State the best protection against sacerdotal tendencies within the Church. In Holland there is in name no State Church, but the State subsidizes the national Reformed Church and maintains State chairs of scientific theology at the State Universities; other theological professors there are maintained by the Church.

We are here concerned not merely with whether in the present circumstances and conditions the Church of England should acquiesce in establishment or seek disestablishment, but with the fundamental question whether any modern State may in principle concern itself with religion or not.

At the basis of the claim that Church and State should be separate lies the assumption, which seemed obvious to seventeenth-century Free Churchmen, that Church and State each had its sphere, which should not and need not clash. And indeed the crucial question is—Where are we to place the dividing-line between Church and State? There is religious freedom of a sort in Russia, but the State maintains antireligious museums, exhibitions and professorships, and atheism is in fact established. In Germany, the so-called German Christians claim that the National Socialist Government has never intervened in the inner spiritual affairs of the German Church as the British Parliament did in rejecting the Church's revised Prayer Book. When Church and State in France were separated in 1905, the separationist or anti-clerical leaders claimed that the law effecting separation, confiscating much church property, etc., concerned not the Church's inner spiritual life or liberty, but only her relations with the external world.

The Roman Church may ridicule the Church of England for being a captive of the State, but by the Concordats she has made with the German and Italian Governments these Governments may veto on political grounds those whom the Church wishes to appoint as bishops or archbishops; and in totalitarian countries political grounds may mean anything.

However, it is inherent in the very idea of a totalitarian State that the Church in it cannot have full freedom, unless indeed the Church controls the State.

It is vitally relevant to our subject to notice that even in the democratic countries there is not complete freedom of opinion and there are totalitarian tendencies in all countries.

No one will accuse the United States of being prejudiced in favour of Fascism or of underestimating the worth of freedom; and, with certain reservations (such as that a Bible is prominently displayed in Congress, and prayers are said at its opening), it is neutral in religion. But there too are totalitarian tendencies: a year or two ago Mr Harry Pollitt, the British Communist leader, was refused admission for a visit to the U.S.A., and recently there has been difficulty over Mr John Strachey. Provision may be made for conscientious objection in those who are American citizens. But a would-be American citizen has to promise to defend, in case of need, the U.S.A. by force of arms; and I understand that this has precluded from receiving American citizenship some well-known foreigners, who would on general grounds make very good citizens. In new areas there, it has at least been threatened that there will be no liberty to build new churches, but only one undenominational union church will be allowed.

France is perhaps more democratic than England, but tendencies to totalitarianism are not wanting. All young men have to spend one or two years training as conscript soldiers; some Christians object on grounds of conscience to military service, but no provision for them is made, nor any alternative form of service allowed; and so these people, some of them a very fine type, are continually going to prison (prison in France is, of course, not to be compared with the concentration camp of Fascist countries, but there it is).

The religious instruction in the English schools presumably, if it has the effect intended, biases the schoolchildren in favour of Christianity. This is typical of much else: we take many things for granted, but no Communist would agree that the State is neutral in England, that children grow up without being exposed to controversial influences, and that all views have an equal chance of making themselves heard. He would say that the difference between Russia and England is not that people in Russia are conditioned, and in England they are left free to choose their own ideas; the difference is simply in the kind of conditioning, and if ours, as is no doubt the case, is done more subtly and less obviously, that only makes it the more real and effective. Mr G. K. Chesterton held that Italians would more readily submit to the restraints of dictatorship than of D.O.R.A.

We are, then, all of us more totalitarian, less neutral and

tolerant than we like to think. Moreover, even where, as in France, there is no religious instruction in the schools, there is ethical teaching of some sort, and the children are thus influenced in some way, though there will be a great difference according as Fascist, Christian, or merely bourgeois ethics are inculcated. The contention of this article is that a State must have some *Weltanschauung*, must be based on some principles and have some aims.

Few of us, indeed, would hold that a completely neutral or tolerant State would be desirable even if it were possible. Tolerance, after all, is only too often the virtue of people who do not believe in anything. Some American experts on religious education say that we should not teach children about God, only let them discover Him for themselves, lest we corrupt their young minds by our own superstitions. Of this, Dr Reinhold Niebuhr says that soon they will bid us not teach them English, since thereby we rob them of the possibility of choosing the German, French or Japanese languages as possible alternatives; and that ignorance of the past does not guarantee freedom from its imperfections. Some guidance, some " moulding," there must be, and if this is indirect and unconscious it is only the more effective.

The question how far State action and control should go crops up at every turn. And there is even in England, beyond question, a tendency to extend the State's sphere. In commercial and industrial matters this is so obvious that it can be taken as admitted. The Lord Chief Justice has in his book *The New Despotism* described the growing powers of bureaucracy in England, and stressed the significance of this. There is a tendency to curb the freedom of the Press, and influence it in various subtle ways, and use against it such surprising weapons as the Official Secrets Act. Influences, negative and positive, are exerted on exhibitors of films dealing with contemporary events.

The Censor may prohibit in England comparatively few books, but, apart from this, there is in the Public Libraries what amounts to an unofficial censorship: libraries may put on a reserved shelf books that they have, so that they are inaccessible unless one knows beforehand they are there and definitely asks for one of them by name.

Apart from the question of voluntary or compulsory National Service, which is almost too obvious to need mention, there are many border-line cases, where opinions differ as to the suitability or otherwise of guiding or

"moulding" by the State. One instance is the recent refusal of the London Passenger Transport Board to provide special inducements to its employees to join the Territorial Army, a refusal which was deplored by both the Ministry of Transport and the Foreign Office. Supporters of the L.P.T.B. argue that the line between offering inducements and applying direct pressure is bound to be thin, and that there should be nothing approaching compulsion; opponents can ask why this national service should be left to individual choice any more than the national service of paying taxes to maintain the unemployed. Another question is whether, in the new housing estates, the State should restrict itself to putting up new houses, or should also establish community centres for recreation, social life and so on, which will help to mould and guide the life of the community.

Another relevant point is the wider sense in which education is now conceived. It used to be said that in Germany the test of education was how much a boy knew when he left school, in England what he himself was. But Nazi educational theory is never tired of stressing the fact that education is not the mere imparting of knowledge, but the development of character, mental capacity being of secondary importance. But the extended conception of education is only a little less true of the democracies, and it represents a great and vital extension of State influence. Even if education be the mere imparting of knowledge, much will depend on what knowledge is imparted. But if it is concerned with the whole personality, it must give some guidance and must be based on some positive ideal.

No doubt there is a difference between the guidance of the democratic State and the moulding of the totalitarian State, but this difference is probably much less than we usually suppose. Competent observers, writing of the future of the Church in Russia, see the chief danger not in persecution but in anti-religious education of the younger generation. Sir Charles Grant Robertson holds that, serious as is the deprivation of civil liberty, and the impossibility of criticizing or controlling the Government, the control of education is the most formidable weapon that the totalitarian State has at its disposal. The fact is that personality may be crushed by measures just as effective as, though much less violent than, the concentration camp and the other paraphernalia of totalitarianism. And, as Dr J. H. Oldham has written, the Church will have won little in obtaining

liberty to preach and conduct its own services if the whole weight of a public system of education is directed towards inculcating youth with beliefs incompatible with Christianity.

An easy belief in the advantages of disestablishment presupposes the possibility of dividing life into different spheres which do not overlap or conflict. This doctrine of separate spheres is now, as we have seen, challenged from the side of the State; but it is challenged also from other sides. Two years ago, when the centenary of Heidelberg University was being celebrated, Herr Rust, the Minister for Education in Nazi Germany, in his speech remarked that the old idea of science, based on the belief in the abstract intellect, is finished; the new science has nothing in common with the conception that its honour lies in an everlasting search for truth. There has recently been a controversy among English scientists, one side maintaining that science should be completely detached and politically neutral, while the other side saw science and scientific research much more as an instrument in the social struggle. The British Association for the Advancement of Science has recently formed a Division of Social and International Relations, an indication that the general body of scientists is forsaking its monastic indifference to worldly affairs. A rather lengthy quotation is perhaps justified from Sir Richard Gregory, F.R.S., who is the pioneer of this movement in England and went to the United States to help with organizing a similar division in the American Association. "The view that the sole function of science is the discovery and study of natural facts and principles without regard to the social implications of the knowledge gained can no longer be maintained. It is being widely recognized that science cannot be divorced from ethics or rightly absolve itself from the human responsibilities in the application of its discoveries to destructive purposes in war or economic disturbances in times of peace. Men of science can no longer stand aside from the social and political questions involved in the structure which has been built up from materials provided by them, and which their discoveries may be used to destroy."[1]

The recent exhibition in London of works of art by famous German artists who have been driven by Herr Hitler out of Germany has drawn attention to the relation of the State

[1] *Guardian*, January 20, 1939, quoting *New York Times*.

to art. Few of us, probably, agree with Herr Hitler's methods of regimenting the arts, but that is not to say that the State may take no interest in art. And normally, except during the last few centuries, since the Renaissance, the State has concerned itself with art. Rarely, if ever, has the finest art been produced by those who worked with the ideal " Art for Art's sake."

Some will maintain that the essence of totalitarianism is compulsion, while, as Professor Hocking says, it is of the essence of the religious spirit always to persuade, never to compel; but the distinction between persuasion and compulsion is not always very clear. Moreover, in history it is clearly not the case that religion has eschewed compulsion, and while the majority of cases where compulsion has been used are no doubt deplorable it is not so clear that this is always and necessarily the case. In 1829 the British Government in India, acting on what it considered Christian motives, suppressed the Hindu religious custom of suttee, or widow-burning, and history does not record any violent protest by the English Free Churches. We may deplore the intervention of the German Nazi Government in the affairs of the Church, but we must recognize that all the Reformers, Calvin no less than Luther and Zwingli, called in the State to help in their work of Reformation; they considered that, in the corrupt condition of the Church, and especially clergy, then, the State represented the Christian laity.

The division of human personality into a " private sphere," in which a man may hold what religious beliefs he will, and a " public sphere," unaffected by those beliefs is thoroughly artificial, and there is something very wrong with any religion which will accept the distinction. We cannot distinguish the sphere of religion or ethics from that of politics. The National-Socialist movement in England is based on anti-Semitism, and its main work is not only to call attention to existing Jewish influence on English life, but, by wildly and inaccurately exaggerating this, to stir up and increase hatred. Is this a political or a moral issue ? It is quite impossible to draw a line. The divisions between the older political parties are no doubt more nearly purely political differences, but there also the rival interests of different classes come in.

Often, no doubt, it is possible to reconcile the claims of the individual and the community, but quite often this

is not the case. Recently in England a secondary-school master refused to pay that proportion of his income tax which he considered was used for armaments and so, inevitably, he was sent to prison; equally a fundamentalist might conscientiously refuse to pay taxes to have evolution taught in schools. When the issue gets to this stage, one can only let either the individual have his way or the community have its way, and a choice is inevitable. As much tolerance as possible is a very good thing: those who are not pacifists should try to enable pacifists to follow their conscience as much as possible; equally, those who are pacifists should work out how, in a pacifist and isolationist State, the minority may be free to follow its conscience and aid in the maintenance of international law and order and the suppression of gangsterdom. But tolerance and liberty are matters of degree, and life is totalitarian, at least in a modified sense.

In history, practically every form of Christianity has been established—has, that is to say, been the basic *Weltanschauung* of a State. Seventeenth-century Congregationalists objected to the establishment of Episcopalianism, but Congregationalism was itself established in some of the New England colonies. Presbyterianism is still established in Scotland. If the Baptists and Methodists have always opposed establishment, that may well be, even if it is not admitted, because they came into the world too late for their faiths to have much chance of becoming the faiths of communities, rather than only of groups drawn out of the community.

Dr Keller has shown, from the experience of countries where the Church is disestablished, some of the disadvantages that are liable in practice to follow. These, interesting as they are, do not affect our main thesis, though they do support our contention that a State which does not claim or strive to be Christian will tend to be non-Christian. Even to the charge that it is rank hypocrisy for any modern State to call itself Christian, there is something to be said in answer. Was Pericles a hypocrite when he spoke of Athenian ideals in his Funeral Speech, and was Lincoln a hypocrite at Gettysburg? If you disestablish Christianity because we are not perfect Christians why should you not disestablish all moral ideals also? It is something to have an ideal, even if you do not completely live up to it.

It may be freely admitted that the position of a national Church is a position more perilous and more difficult to hold than has commonly been recognized in the past. Few would argue that the present condition of the establishment in England is satisfactory; and, apart from this, a strategic retreat to a position of disestablishment might perhaps be wise. Our contention is only that the doctrine of separate spheres of Church and State, on which is based the ideal of the Free Church, has never been completely held, and is anyhow increasingly breaking down. Church and State as two concentric circles, man's duty to God including his duty to the State, but going much beyond this, would represent the truth better.

At the beginning of the twentieth century there was a movement in the Church of Sweden to deepen its essential nature and it took the watchword " The Swedish people—a people of God ": the Swedish people, not just a few odd individuals; an aspiration which we may take as summing up the contention that, since a State must be based on some ideals and principles, and cannot be universally neutral and tolerant, national recognition of Christianity is not in principle bad: indeed, that in a world where community is of increasing importance we must choose between national recognition of Christianity and national recognition of paganism.

G. F. S. Gray.

Some Aspects of Dante's Teaching on the Mystery of Redemption

The whole of the *Divina Commedia*, regarded as allegory, sets forth the mystery of man's redemption by Christ; but it is not until Paradise is reached that Dante gives us a formal exposition of the doctrine of the Atonement. The spirit of Virgil, the representative of human wisdom, reason, philosophy, is the guide through Hell, and—though in a lesser degree—through Purgatory, and he has many things to teach his pupil. But he is superseded by the glorified Beatrice, the august symbol of Divine Wisdom, theology, the Revelation entrusted to the keeping of the Church, and it is she who must instruct him in matters of faith. Her teaching on the Atonement is introduced in a way which is curious, to say the least, but is eminently characteristic

of Dante. In the second of the ten heavens which constitute his Paradise, the poet-seer is welcomed by Justinian, who sings of the glories of the Roman Empire over which he had once held sway. What might be called the *leit-motif* of this chant is self-sacrifice, the saint showing how Rome's greatness had been due to a long line of heroes and patriots. But, he says, " to the clear eye and pure heart " it is manifest that all her mighty deeds and conquests were as nothing compared with the crowning glory granted her of avenging the Divine wrath.[1] This sentence is later explained to the wondering Dante by Beatrice, whose words may be thus summarized.

Adam by his disobedience condemned himself and his entire offspring to exile from Paradise. The race lay in darkness and impotence until the Word of God became incarnate. Human nature thus united with the Divine was of course holy, but punishment was still due for sin, and the ban remained. In the sentence of death passed by Pilate on the Saviour, Dante sees the just judgment of God pronounced on guilty humanity collectively present in the Person of Christ. From one point of view the Crucifixion was the most terrible crime ever committed, and the earth trembled with horror. But for this injustice the Jews are made wholly responsible. Their punishment by Titus at the siege of Jerusalem was a further honour bestowed on Rome.[2] In the *De Monarchia* Dante is at pains to show that the Roman Empire was *de jure*. This, he feels, is proved by the fact that Christ chose to be born under edict of Roman authority. And he considers, moreover, that, had the Empire not been thus divinely constituted, the Crucifixion could not have satisfied the Divine Justice. " If, then, Christ," he says, " had not suffered under a qualified judge, that suffering would not have been a punishment. And the judge could not have been qualified had he not had jurisdiction over the whole human race that was to be punished in the flesh of Christ, who, as the prophet saith, was bearing or sustaining our sins."[3]

The above theory is, so far as I know, peculiar to Dante. It seems strange that he did not base his argument in its support on those mysterious words of our Lord to Pilate: " Thou couldest have no power at all against Me except

[1] *Par.* vi. [2] *Par.* vii.
[3] *De Mon.*, Bk. ii., Cap. 12 and 13 (Temple Classics).

it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered Me unto thee hath the greater sin." Pilate is of course regarded as having been an *unconscious* instrument in the hands of Divine Justice, and the bitter reference to Philip the Fair in the *Purgatorio* as *il nuovo Pilato*[1] proves, if proof were needed, that Dante did not condone the personal cowardice of the Roman governor. But one does wonder whether the special part assigned to Rome in the scheme of Redemption accounts for there being no mention of him in the *Inferno*. Annas and Caiaphas are tortured and degraded in the Valley of the Hypocrites, and Judas is mangled by the jaws of the Arch-fiend in the nethermost Hell of the Traitors. Perhaps Dante mentally relegated Pilate to the sordid doom of the Trimmers in Ante-hell, of whom he makes Virgil say—" Let us not speak of them, but look and pass."

The explanation of Justinian's words will have only an academic interest for modern readers, but it is followed by a discourse much more profound. Beatrice answers Dante's unspoken question—that which has troubled so many hearts and consciences. Why did God will such a method of salvation? Dante would most certainly have agreed with Anselm that " there were reasons for this truth more important and more numerous than his own or any mortal mind could comprehend." But it is noteworthy that he puts two only into the mouth of Beatrice. The method taken satisfied perfectly the Divine justice and exhibited perfectly the Divine generosity. God might have remitted the penalty—the way of mercy alone. Or He might have demanded satisfaction—the way of justice alone. He revealed His infinite goodness in taking *both* ways. Man could not have rendered satisfaction unaided, for no humble obedience on his part could outweigh the sin of his proud rebellion. Human nature could not regain its primal dignity unless it could perfectly balance the pleasure taken in evil-doing by the pain of punishment. But the death of the Incarnate Word could, and did, satisfy Divine justice; while mercy was shown Man by enabling him to " raise himself " to his lost estate.

In so far as this view is forensic, it is open to the same criticism as that passed by Dr Moberly on the *Cur Deus Homo*. He says that sin, by St Anselm's definition, is made

[1] *Par.* vii.

" quantitative, and, as quantitative, external to the self of the sinner, and measurable, as if it had a self in itself. The problem caused by sin is exhibited as if it were a faulty equation, which, by fresh balancing of quantities, is to be equated aright. But, in fact, sin is not in what I *do*, so really as in what I *am*. What I am may be evidenced, nay, may be actualized, through what I do. Yet the sin lies not in the deed, as deed; but in ' I ' as doer of the deed. The ' I ' is not distinguishable from the sin. The sin is within the ' I.' It is in what ' I ' am."

Dr Moberly writes beautifully and sympathetically of Anselm's teaching and says in its defence: " He is trying to give symmetrical expression in terms of logic to a faith which lies deeper than his essay towards a logical exposition of it."[1] May not the same be said of the poet who has put so much of scholastic teaching into immortal verse? It is not simply the seventh canto of the *Paradiso*, comprehensive though that is, which we must study if we would really understand Dante's teaching on the Atonement. In the lines referred to—and other instances could be adduced—he may speak of sin as if it were a " faulty equation," and " something external to the self of the sinner," but such a conception is alien to the spirit of the *Commedia* as a whole. It is true that in the *Inferno* we cannot always feel that the " I " is indistinguishable from the sin. The tragedy of the first *cantica* is felt most poignantly when Dante meets sinners who in unspeakable degradation and torment still retain nobility of character. It is with amazement and anguish that the poet cries to one whose memory he still reverences on earth: " Are *you* here, Ser Brunetto?" He and Guido da Montefeltro, to name but two, are in everlasting torment because they did not repent of specific acts of sin. Such instances naturally stand out in our minds. But they are, after all, exceptions. In the vast majority of cases we feel that the sin is an integral part of the " I." Sometimes it

[1] Dr Moberly continues: " The quantitative character of the conception comes out very clearly as Anselm works towards his final conclusions. The question is how to cancel the great ' amount ' of the ' debt ' of humanity to God. The service of Christ's life as man does not count for this purpose, for that was anyhow *due*, a due of humanity to God. But his death was (*a*) not due, and (*b*) infinite in amount. Therefore the amount of this, which was *not* due, being infinite, outweighed the amount of all the sins of the world, which though vast were not literally infinite." (*Atonement and Personality*, pp. 370 *f.*)

has become so identified with it that individuality itself has been destroyed. The " undiscerning lives " of those who had loved money for its own sake, whether to squander or to hoard, had so affected their characters in this life that when they reached Hell their faces were indistinguishable the one from the other. This awful degradation was not an arbitrary punishment imposed from without; it was merely the effect of the sin of the miser and spendthrift. And although the *Inferno* presents us with diverse individual portraits, drawn by a master-hand, this principle runs through the *cantica*. So that—to take but a few instances—we see the carnal sinners tossed and driven by the winds of their unbridled passions; flatterers immersed in the filth of their insincerity; hypocrites weighed down by the cloaks of their hypocrisy; traitors imprisoned in the ice of their treachery.

In the *Purgatorio*, too, we see the effects of sin variously depicted by penal suffering. But now the pain is purifying as well as penal. The penances are pictures of sin as seen through the eyes of pardoned penitents whose earthly values have been completely reversed. The souls now feel former pride as a heavy burden, envy as a blinding pain, wrath as a bitter fog, sloth as an unceasing weariness, avarice as a shameful captivity, greed as a disfiguring craving, lust as a consuming fire. They scarcely ever tell Dante of acts of sin committed in this life. Why indeed should they? for these have all been washed away. But they speak of past *sinfulness*, the once-cherished canker in the soul, which had been the root of overt deeds of wickedness. It is this that they mourn with penitential tears—the " slough " which prevents their seeing God. Virgil shows Dante that all seven capital sins are, in one way or another, sins against love. And this underlying unity is further suggested when the removal of the wound symbolizing pride results immediately in the six remaining scars becoming less deep.

Most of the shades whom Dante meets in Purgatory have been cleansed by the Blood of Christ applied formally in the Sacrament of Penance. But when this means of grace had been unattainable, " one little tear " of true penitence, albeit shed at the moment of death, had availed for salvation. Even excommunication could not place the contrite soul beyond the reach of the arms of the Divine Mercy.

But though pardoned and beyond the reach of temptation,

the Holy Souls have to render that "satisfaction" which, according to Catholic theology, is demanded from all Christians, in one form or another, either here or hereafter.[1] Those whom Dante meets seem all to have been guilty of mortal sin, and their sufferings are great and of long duration. But they do not simply bear their pain with resignation as a necessary means to a longed-for end. Rather they embrace it with exultation as a precious means of self-utterance. "Pain!" cries one. "I ought to say Solace!" And the same shade speaks of "the sweet wormwood of the torments." Those purging lasciviousness are careful not to step outside the fire of shame and suffering, for every throb of anguish is precious to them in their passion of repentance. One might almost say that the Avaricious and Prodigal, lying face downwards and motionless through the centuries, are not bound by any fetters save those of their own desire. They do indeed long unceasingly to see God; at the same time they long with passionate intensity to stay where they are until they are fit to behold Him. It is the resolving of this inner conflict of desires which is a sign to them that they are truly "free." Even shame—in the sense of undue regard for man's opinion—is lost in the depths of the contrition of Dante's Purgatory, so that those purging gluttony, whose faces are so disfigured by fasting as to be unrecognizable, are *glad*, we are told, to be pointed out by name to the pilgrim. And one of these was once a pope who was over-fond of eels and sweet wine!

This attitude of Dante's penitents seems to throw new light on Beatrice's words to the effect that God showed more generosity in giving Himself as Man upon the Cross in order that His creature might "raise himself" than if He had simply remitted the penalty due to sin. Possibly Dante meant no more than Newman meant when he wrote:

> O wisest love! that flesh and blood,
> Which did in Adam fail,
> Should strive afresh against the foe,
> Should strive and should prevail.

[1] The penance can be shortened by the prayer of love rising from a heart living in grace on earth. For, it is explained, "the height of justice is not abased because fire of love fulfils in one moment the satisfaction which he owes who here is lodged." (*Purg.* vi. 37-39, T.C. translation.)

But surely it is not far-fetched to read a fuller and deeper meaning into the passage in the *Paradiso*? Beatrice's words at least suggest that Dante is thinking not simply of Christ in His representative character, but of fallen Man, rendered helpless by the sin of Adam, being enabled through the Incarnation and Death of the Saviour to become a partaker in his own restoration. He can, if he will, have a real share in the atoning sacrifice offered once for all upon the Cross. The *Commedia* is a picture, a setting forth by means of allegory, of this co-operation between the creature and the Creator. It shows us Man dying with Christ, buried with Him, and finally sharing with Him in the ineffable joys of Heaven. The spiritual pilgrimage begins on Good Friday, and Dante, the "Everyman" of the parable, emerges from the pit of Hell just before dawn on Easter Day. As the sun rises, he sees the Angel of Faith bringing the souls of the Redeemed in a boat across the shining waters which surround the Mount of Purification. The happy Dead, freed from the burden of the flesh, sing their psalm of deliverance, the *In exitu Israel*, which the Church has always held to be an allegory of the redemption of the world by Christ.

Dante's dread pilgrimage from "outer darkness" to that "light of dawn that shineth more and more unto the perfect day," necessitates the utmost effort on his part. But it could not have been undertaken, still less persevered in, had it not been for Divine interposition and aid. This is made quite clear at the outset, and we are continually reminded of his utter dependence, direct and indirect, on God.

Dante's Purgatory, in its purely allegorical aspect, symbolizes the life of penitence and upward striving, the "Purgative Way" of the mystics, by the soul that has been converted and forgiven. The entrance is strictly guarded by an angel who has received his commission from St Peter and so from Christ. The steps leading to the locked doors symbolize contrition, confession and satisfaction—the three "parts" of the Sacrament of Penance. So the journey of the penitent begins with pardon through the Precious Blood. But as absolution does not extirpate the roots of sin in the soul, Dante, in his character of "Everyman," has to have carved on his forehead wounds symbolizing the seven capital sins. These scars are removed one by one at each successive stage of the pilgrimage by the wing of an angel who represents a conquering virtue.

On the summit of the Mountain of Purgation is the Earthly Paradise guarded by a wall of fire reminiscent of the flaming sword of Genesis. The pilgrim souls pass through the flames, and are welcomed on the other side by a Voice singing "Come, ye blessed of My Father." According to Dante's teaching—original so far as I know—Christ's perfect obedience unto death not only restores to fallen Man the hope of Heaven, but also that of enjoying those pure earthly delights which were forfeited by the Fall. The Terrestrial Paradise is made the final preparation for the Celestial.

Here for a space Dante lays aside his representative character. He is no longer Man spelt with a capital, but *a* man, Dante Alighieri, whose conscience is burdened by the remembrance of personal sin. In the *Convivio* he had tried to gloss over an unworthy past, but now he feels impelled to make an open and sincere confession. This he does with agony and self-abasement. But, taught perhaps by his own inner experience, he knows that even the absolute assurance of Divine forgiveness cannot always blot out bitter memories in the minds of true penitents. So he gives us his lovely parable of Lethe and Eunoë. These blessed rivers of rest and renewal flow in the Earthly Paradise now restored to the soul of Man, redeemed and cleansed by the Precious Blood. Lethe drowns all memory of guilt; Eunoë revives all memory of good. Inasmuch as good and evil are so inextricably mingled in this world, that the one cannot be satisfactorily recalled without the other, Eunoë also brings back the remembrance of sin, but this without any alloy of sadness. Thus penitence is transmuted into an immortal bliss, and saints in Dante's Heaven can look back on a polluted past with gratitude undimmed by the faintest shadow of regret.

Dante's picture of penitence in the *Purgatorio* is one of unique and extraordinary beauty. But probably many Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, are conscious of a certain incompleteness in it. For that which is usually regarded as the most powerful incentive to contrition seems to be entirely lacking in the training of the penitents. There is scarcely a suggestion that they ever meditate on the sufferings of the Saviour, or that they feel that the sins for which they are doing penance were in any way responsible for His Passion. They contemplate the holy character of Mary. And they are inspired, or warned, by examples

drawn from history both sacred and profane, and from classical mythology. Except the *Agnus Dei*, chanted by the Once-Wrathful, not one of the devotions assigned the penitents leads their thoughts to the Cross. Three shades refer to the Passion when speaking to Dante. One speaks of the vengeance taken by Titus at the siege of Jerusalem. Another prophesies the outrages inflicted on Dante's enemy, Boniface VIII, seeing in them a second crucifixion of Christ in the person of His Vicar. The third, Forese, is purging gluttony. Famished with hunger and parched with thirst, he and his companions have to pass and re-pass a fruit-laden tree and a refreshing spring, upon which they are forced to gaze with unappeasable longing. And he says that they are drawn towards their penance by the same desire that drew " *Glad* Christ " to utter the cry of dereliction. Truly an amazing thought ! And it reveals incidentally the penitents' sense of oneness with Christ in His sufferings and in the joy inseparable from those sufferings. But neither here nor elsewhere do we find that passion of personal sorrow which shook the soul of St Francis when he contemplated the Crucifix, or which inspired Abelard, Jacapone da Todi and others when writing of the Passion. Why is this ? In order to answer this question I think we have to ask another. What did sin mean—*primarily*—to Dante ? Not, apparently, the wounding of a Father's love or a Saviour's tenderness. He seems to have thought of it, first and foremost, as that which separates Man from God. It is hideous, defiling, grotesque; robbing him of that unique dignity and beauty with which he had been endowed, and preventing his fulfilling his glorious destiny. When in the Earthly Paradise Dante confesses his personal sin, he is moved to an agonized repentance, not by the thought of the Divine Love which he had outraged, but by the realization of the terrible contrast between what he actually is and what he was meant to be. So his shame and contrition do not find expression in the cry of the Prodigal in the Gospel—" Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before *thee*," but in that of the sin-stained creature to the Creator —" Purge me with hyssop and I shall be *clean*."

Yet it is impossible to believe that Dante felt nothing of the compelling force of the Passion in the sphere of penitence. However we interpret his silence on the subject, one thing is certain: he did not care to dwell on the purely physical sufferings of the Saviour. He loved to contemplate the

glory rather than the humiliation of the Cross. One imagines that when he knelt in spirit at the Feet of the Crucified, he always saw a great triumphal progress—God in Man despoiling the powers of darkness, opening the gates of righteousness, exulting in the accomplishment of His purpose for the world. Dante never forgets for a moment that Christ is the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity—God of God, Light of Light. It is the " Supreme Might " who suffers; a " Mighty One crowned with victory " who descends into Hell. No word in the *Commedia* is allowed to rhyme with the word *Cristo*. In the Heaven of Fixed Stars there is a vision of the Incarnate Lord surrounded by the Church Triumphant, and Dante's sight, albeit cleansed and strengthened, cannot endure the glory of that Presence, so that It is withdrawn in compassion.

We feel in the *Commedia* the same lofty spirit which pervades the ancient liturgies, the Passiontide hymns of Fortunatus, and the Eucharistic praises of St Thomas Aquinas. But there is scarcely an echo in the whole of the *Commedia* of the *Jesu, dulcis memoria*, dear to so many generations of Christians, although Dante had a special veneration for its author. The presence of Mary rests like a gracious benediction on the rugged Mount of Purgation, for it is she, rather than her divine Son, who is chiefly thought of as the Friend of sinners. But at least He may be said to bless the pilgrim at every stage of the ascent, for the Beatitudes sound like music throughout the journey—music telling of victory and celestial peace. And if we cannot help feeling sometimes that the Christ of the *Commedia* is too remote, let us remind ourselves of that passage in the *Paradiso* which reveals so much of tenderness towards the Sacred Humanity:

> Quale è colui, che forse di Croazia,
> Viene a veder la Veronica nostra,
> Che per l'antica fama non si sazia,
> Ma dice nel pensier, fin che si mostra:
> " Signor mio Gesù Cristo, Dio verace,
> Or fu sì fatta la sembianza vostra ?"[1]

Dante tells us by means of allegory that the two natures in the One Person of Christ must be contemplated separately

[1] " Even as he that perchance cometh from Croatia to see our Veronica, and is not satiated by its ancient fame, but saith in his heart whilst it is being shown: ' My Lord Jesus Christ, Very God, was this then the fashion of Thy Countenance ?' " (*Par.* xxxi. 103-108.)

in the revelation granted us on earth.[1] It is only in the light of Paradise that man can hope to understand the doctrine of "the Manhood taken into God." Beholding at last the glory of the Beatific Vision—the goal of the pilgrimage—the seer would fain penetrate the mystery of the Incarnation. A flash of spiritual insight is indeed granted him, but this is followed by oblivion so profound that he would not know that the revelation had been his, were it not for the sweetness of serenity which now possesses his soul, and the knowledge that his will is now irrevocably one with the will of God.[2]

This last thought takes our minds to the dedicatory letter to Can Grande, in which Dante tells his patron that the whole poem was undertaken not for speculative but for practical reasons. So we are not surprised when he teaches that the wondrous vision of the Cross in the fifth heaven can be rightly appreciated only by those who take up the cross in obedient following of Christ. In the ruddy light of the planet Mars, Dante beholds the warrior-saints —martyrs and crusaders—each of whom appears as a glorious star, while together they form a mighty cross set athwart the sky. And in some way—mystic, ineffable—they flash forth a vision of the Crucified, in whose steps they had followed and in whose strength they had overcome. Thus we are shown that their self-sacrifice in time had been caught up into eternity, and mystically united with the one perfect oblation offered for the redemption of the world. In the *Purgatorio* we saw man co-operating in his own salvation; in the *Paradiso* we see him co-operating in the salvation of others.[3] Dante tells us, moreover, that the warrior-saints sing a wondrous song of praise. This is of too exalted a nature for his understanding, except that he hears the call —"Arise and conquer." Is not this to say that the full meaning of self-sacrifice, vicarious suffering, cannot be comprehended in this world, but that Heaven will one day reveal it to the obedient disciple? And that though we cannot hope to share here and now in the rapture which belongs in eternity to the conquerors of pain, yet we may, if we will, catch echoes of its strange, celestial music and at least understand its call to follow them to victory and peace?

The above are some aspects of Dante's teaching on the

[1] *Purg.* xxxi. 122-126. [2] *Par.* xxxiii. 8. [3] *Par.* xiv.

Mystery of Redemption. To some minds his formal exposition will be unconvincing, to some inadequate, to others again a masterly summary of Catholic theological teaching on the subject. But no Christian, whatever his particular school of thought, would quarrel with the spirit in which the poet suggests that we should approach the study of religious difficulties. Whatever we may think of the strange context, we should all agree with the *principle* put into the mouth of Justinian—viz., that if we would discern the working out of the Divine purpose in history, we need the " clear eye " of the honest seeker after truth, and the " pure heart " of the humble and devout believer. Further, Beatrice says to Dante: " Thou dost say: ' Yes, I understand what I hear; but why God willed *this* method of redemption is hidden from me.' Brother, this decree is hidden from all those whose intellect is not ripened by Love." It was in the spirit of fervent love as well as of eager inquiry that Dante's Masters—Fathers and Schoolmen —approached the study of the Atonement. And this love was that of which he writes in the *Paradiso*—a power controlling the entire being, constraining them to follow Christ along the path of obedience and self-sacrifice. As theologians they sometimes differed from one another in theory, when expounding the Mysteries of the Faith, but in spirit they were always one. This is beautifully shown in the fourth heaven when Dante hears those who had been bitter opponents on earth singing in celestial harmony of the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation.[1]

Moreover, they were ever at one in the unassailable conviction—that which sheds light even on Dante's path through Hell—that no conceivable failure on the part of Church or State in the world can frustrate the working out of the Divine purpose in the soul of the individual believer, or rob the Cross of its ultimate victory over sin and death.

LUCY REDPATH.

---

[1] " Here in the sacred poem," writes Dr Edmund Gardner, " the supposed heretic [Siger of Brabant] stands at the doctor's [Aquinas'] left hand, sharing the same glory in Paradise, seen no longer as a misbeliever, a false teacher, an opponent, but as one who laboured no less zealously for the truth, and whose labour proved no less acceptable before Truth's changeless throne—albeit he saw not the truth in all respects with the eyes of the man who triumphed where he fell." (The writer adds that Siger was an " unconscious heretic.") (*Dante and the Mystics*, pp. 263 *f.*)

Some Axioms of a Catholic Christology

THE present paper attempts no more than to present several points which the writer believes to be essential in any statement of the doctrine of Christ which will be loyal to the traditional estimate of the significance of our Lord and in line with the best modern critical study. The points are given seriatim, with some concluding comments.

1. The Christian faith in Jesus Christ as more than a "mere" man (whatever that phrase means) is based primarily on the total impact of His Personality, especially as known to us through the apostolic witness. We have much less certainty about the strictly "biographical" Jesus than has often been claimed. The most we can say in that direction is that the faith in Him as the Incarnate Lord is congruous with the gospels; it certainly cannot be proved from them. This alters the old stress on fulfilment of prophecy and on miracles. The latter are secondary, and may have only a "symbolic" but very real value as recording the total impression which Christ made on those who knew Him. The reasoned Christian faith in our Lord is the result of the apprehension of what He was and is, what He did and does, in and for men.

2. Jesus Christ was genuinely human. Not merely did He possess a human body; He had a human mind and soul —His psychology was human through and through. Even His knowledge of God was creaturely, enlightened no doubt by grace to a unique degree, but of the same kind as our own knowledge of God. Ignorance of human affairs, and other natural human traits (sin alone excepted, if that be an essential human trait, which we deny), must also be admitted. Likewise His "mighty acts" whatever they may have been were done as man: "The Incarnate never leaves His incarnation." Such a position is the logical result of the traditional Catholic doctrine of the Person of Christ, although much orthodoxy has forgotten the fact. Our Lord is true man.

3. Jesus Christ is also divine. This cannot be claimed in any reduced sense. If He is divine, He is God: there are no "degrees of Deity." Christ does for men the work of God; He has "the value of God"; and if that be true He must in some real sense be God. The whole point of Christianity is that men are conscious of the fact that in

the total complex event which we call Christ—in the life, death, resurrection, and what followed—God has made His greatest and most effectual impact upon them, evoking the response of adoration, love and service. Jesus Christ is true God: this is the evaluation which Christian experience consistently has put upon Him. Anything less is not fully Christian.

4. Deity and humanity are not the same thing. God is always God, and man is always man; and no matter how splendid men may become they will never be identical with God. Pantheism, monism, immanentism are religion's most dangerous enemies. An adequate philosophy will see God and man intimately united, but never equated. On the other hand, the derived reality of this world, and man in it, are penetrated by the Divine Being, who is everywhere active, in varying degrees and modes of intensity and significance.

5. In Christ humanity and Deity are brought together in an intimate and enduring unity, which is not only ethical but in a deep sense metaphysical—*i.e.*, united in their essential nature or stuff. As Jesus is human, and as He is divine, so also He is one Person. If humanity and Deity are not the same, then we must say that in Him humanity at its best is the adequate vehicle and instrument for God's activity and purpose among men; that the divine and human are so closely related that every act is done both by God and by man, and yet done by one Person. In Gwatkin's words, Jesus Christ is one who is as divine as God and as human as any man.

6. Since God's activity is prevenient to any response from men, it is accurate to speak of Christ as God-Man, rather than Man-God—the divine is always prior to the human. All human activity is answer (by way of conformity or refusal) to the impact of reality upon man; therefore God is the formative and controlling factor in the life of Christ. We may picture this interpenetration of divine and human in Christ, with the divine as the initiating agent, as somewhat after the likeness of that interpenetration which we know in human friendship and love.

7. It is necessary to insist upon a congruity between that concentrated or intensified presence and activity of God in Christ and His more general presence and activity. Our Lord cannot have significance for us if He appears as " a

bolt from the blue"; rather He must be seen as one who harmonizes with and is expressive of the transcendent divine Reality in and behind things, and His "emergence" must be in line with the movement of that Reality to and in man.

In man generally the response to God and the consequent expression of God—who is ever root and ground undergirding human life and seeking utterance through it—is broken, sporadic, frustrated by sin and self-will. In Christ, full manhood by long prevenient preparation is taken by God to be the adequate instrument or vehicle of that utterance and self-expression of Himself to man. Does this imply a difference of degree rather than kind between Christ and men? One would answer yes, but would add that the resultant "quality" is also quite different; and that the fundamental question remains, not what *sort* of difference is it, but *how great* is the difference. Sinful man is yet made in the image of God, and is indwelt by the Word of God; in Christ human nature becomes the very image of God, and the Word is fully "enfleshed."

8. On the other hand, it is equally necessary to insist that the appearance of Christ and the emergence of the Christian fellowship constitutes a decisive moment in world history. Just as there come times in an individual's life when something of supreme and determinative significance occurs, and likewise in the history of a nation or a social group; so it is in the story of God in His dealings with men. Our Lord is no "bolt from the blue," but He *is* the uniquely effectual and the supremely challenging act of God, among many acts of God which together constitute the divine-human relationship. It is by our response to that central and decisive act of God when once we know it that destiny is determined. There is judgment in His appearance in the world; and "this is the judgment, that men have loved darkness rather than light, for their works are evil." But with the judgment there is mercy; in Christ the loving-kindness of God our Saviour is shed abroad, and men are offered the possibility of being re-made in the divine image and conformed to the likeness of Christ.

In providing some explanation for the uniquely full and intimate relationship of God and man which Christians believe to have been effected in our Lord, the most fruitful approach is along the lines of an incarnational philosophy. Such a philosophy, starting from the historic impact of

God upon men in Christ, would regard the entire created world as an incarnation, of which the historic fact of Christ is a focus—but a burning focus which quickens and intensifies the whole incarnational activity which it supremely illustrates.

Such a view will safeguard the uniqueness of Christ as coming to men in some real sense as "an other," and yet will guarantee that He is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. The total discontinuity which certain contemporary theologians (the Barthians, for example) urge is a denial of the fundamental postulate of the Catholic Faith, which is that man despite his sin is capable of revealing God and of sharing in the divine nature and purpose.

It might also be pointed out that if such a high position be accorded to Christ, the doctrine of the Trinity seems to follow of necessity. In no other way (as Dorner urged) can we protect whatever is essential in the notion of divine immutability—indeed, without some such doctrine we could not even conceive of God's revealing Himself, much less incarnating Himself. Furthermore, since there are vast stretches of Deity which will ever remain unknown to man, it is reasonable to postulate from the fact of the divine self-disclosure an eternal activity or mode of being—the Word—which is God self-expressive and self-expressed. It is this "corner" of Deity which is uniquely and definitively incarnate, for us men and for our salvation, in the historic Jesus, and through Him in the Body of Christ which is redeemed humanity. And the responsive movement of creation to God, quickened by the Incarnation, is itself so intimately part of the divine activity that it is properly seen as revelation of another eternal activity or mode of being in God Himself—the Holy Spirit.

Finally, it may be urged that the distinctions in the work of the Logos, made by the early Apologists, provide very significant suggestions for the development of the doctrine of the Incarnation. In God there is the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, the eternal self-expression of the unexhausted Deity, immanent in the Godhead; there is the eternally proceeding Word, λόγος προφορικός, "the heavenly word proceeding forth" in all creation and all incarnational activity; again, there is in men λόγος σπερματικός, the enlightening "seed of a deiform nature"; and finally, λόγος ἔνσαρκος, the Word fully "enfleshed," made man in a genuine human nature with all its qualities and limitations, the eternal

self-expression of God adequately actualized as man among men in the historic process.

In Christ this ceaselessly emergent universe has reached, in the divine purpose, a new and supreme level, which may be called God-manhood. Into that level, which is the extension of the Incarnation in Christ, all men are to be taken, until there comes the "full-grown man, the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." It is this Body of Christ which will be the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

Thus we may say that in the genuine humanity of Jesus Christ, with all that is implied in that term, man has been given the central, definitive and decisive revelation of God —a revelation in act, in history, in "happenedness" in "presence and very self," but yet in human idiom; and a revelation in terms of which God is known for what He is, man for what he is meant to be, power is released for man and human destiny made manifest. Here is an enduring fact which will sustain us both in the days of crisis and in the days of peace, for it illuminates both.

W. Norman Pittenger.

Charles Dickens and the Church

The Pickwick Papers appeared in 1836. According to G. M. Young (*Victorian England*), the work of the Evangelicals was done by 1830, and faith began to harden into a code. Up to about 1850, Evangelical observances strengthened their hold on the upper and middle classes, so that Dickens' first period of writing fell within a time of unchallenged Evangelical supremacy. Like most busy men, he probably relied for his prejudices on early impressions, so that we need not look for any development in his views about religion. He was born in a Church of England family, but his leanings were all humanitarian, and in 1843 he attached himself for a time to a Unitarian congregation (A. W. Ward, *Dickens*, p. 183). The novels have no theological interest whatever, but they reflect popular ideas, and must in their turn have contributed largely to the reinforcement and propagation of these ideas. Intellectual

difficulties seem to be non-existent. Religion, or rather religiosity, is presupposed as a vague background.

Before we look at the novels, we may ask whether Dickens' idea of the Church is not as inaccurate as his idea of cricket. In the famous description of Dingley Dell *v.* All-Muggleton, we are told that Dumkins and Podder scored 54, and when their wickets had fallen Dingley Dell had scored 0. At an early stage in the game the latter gave in, without apparently batting at all. Dickens' caricatures of Dissenting ministers are probably no more trustworthy. But he views them entirely from the outside. He must have known something about so powerful an institution as the Church of England, and his testimony at least registers faithfully the popular verdict as regards things in general, though his details may be as inaccurate as his cricket lore.

David Copperfield's first impressions of Blunderstone Church have the photographic accuracy of a child's memories. The high-backed pew; the window through which Peggotty looked to be sure the house was not on fire; the sheep hesitating at the open door of the porch; the monumental tablets; the pulpit, suggesting to him a boy playing "King of the Castle" and repelling another boy who comes up the stairs to attack; the preacher's velvet cushion with tassels. Then, again, Canterbury Cathedral—"the earthy smell, the sunless air . . . the resounding of the organ through the black and white arched galleries and aisles" (chapter xviii). *Dombey and Son* has another vivid picture, of a town church this time, attended for a christening (chapter v), in which the light and air of Blunderstone have vanished. "So chill and earthy was the place. The tall shrouded pulpit and reading desk; the dreary perspective of empty pews stretching away under the galleries, and empty benches mounting to the roof and lost in the shadow of the great grim organ; the dusty matting and cold stone slabs; the grisly free seats in the aisles; and the damp corner by the bell-rope. . . ." By contrast, St Clement Danes, where Mrs Lirriper of *Christmas Stories* worshipped, is cheerful: "where I now have a sitting in a very pleasant pew with genteel company and my own hassock, and being partial to evening service not too crowded."

In describing a country church Dickens could be farcical. Little Nell in *The Old Curiosity Shop* reached a village within

sight of the Welsh mountains. " It was a very aged, ghostly place . . . and had once a convent or monastery attached." High up in the walls of the church were " small galleries, where the nuns had been wont to glide along—dimly seen in their dark dresses so far off—or to pause like gloomy shadows, listening to the prayers." The church had a crypt, a dim and murky spot in which was a well, " dug at first (thought the sexton) to make the old place more gloomy, and the old monks more religious."

English sentiment, says G. M. Young, clung to a picture of traditional village life with piously observed Sundays, " as Roman sentiment saw in the Sabine farm the home of virtue and national greatness " (*Victorian England*, p. 21). This helps to account for Dickens' idealization of the gentle white-haired country clergyman by contrast with the town parson whom he disliked. The " simple-hearted old gentleman, of a shrinking, subdued spirit," who comforted little Nell is typical (*The Old Curiosity Shop*, chapter lii); he ministered to a flock of " humble folks," many coming three or four miles to church. Tom Pinch, the organist of the village church in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, is a much loved figure. From chapter xxxi we learn that the organ was in a loft, and as the organist worked the bellows with his feet it evidently had no pedals. Mr Pecksniff played the eavesdropper on Tom and Mary, hidden in a high red-curtained pew. When Tom had gone he sought the vestry, where he helped himself to port wine and biscuits and was startled by the appearance of two surplices, one black, the other white, in a cupboard. When Oliver Twist reaches the country (chapter xxxii) he is taught by the clergyman, " a white-haired old gentleman . . . who spoke so kindly." On Sunday " there was the little church . . . the sweet-smelling air stealing in at the low porch, and filling the homely building with its fragrance. The poor people were so neat and clean, and knelt so reverently in prayer." The clergyman of Dingley Dell in *Pickwick Papers* is sympathetically sketched. The whole party go to church on Christmas morning, and Bob Sawyer carves his name in letters four inches long (chapter xxviii). " The Convict's Return," the tale told in chapter vi, refers to " the communion-table before which he had so often repeated the Commandments he had reverenced as a child, and forgotten as a man " —presumably the " Lord, have mercy . . ." of the ante-communion service is meant. In *Reprinted Pieces* (" Sunday

as it might be made") Dickens speaks with high praise of the village parson who organizes cricket on Sunday evening, which may be a genuine reminiscence.

We must not forget Traddles' father-in-law in *David Copperfield*, the curate in Devonshire, who had ten children, mostly girls, none of whom apparently works for her living. Traddles visits Devonshire, walking there in eight days.[1] The best paid curates at this period were in the diocese of Rochester, according to G. M. Young (p. 63), where stipends reached £109 a year.

In contrast to the country clergy, the town, or rather suburban, curate in "Our Parish" (*Sketches by Boz*) is described as an effeminate person, fussed over by pious women. The poor people rise to bow and curtsy as the rich lady enters. *Little Dorrit* displays a real *animus* against the Church. The church bell is maddening, the congregation scanty. Clennam passes the lighted "windows of a congregationless church." The ways of a cathedral in the pre-Restoration era are depicted in *Edwin Drood*, with Durdles the verger tapping the walls for traces of "old 'uns."

Were churches really empty in Dickens' London? The bulk of the people according to him were not in the least Sabbatarian. The typical city man sits out in the garden reading a Sunday paper. The people in summer pour out to tea gardens and crowd the river Thames (*Sketches by Boz*, sketches ix and x). Many steamers ply, loaded with excursionists. Churches, indeed, are well filled, but with fashionable folk; the sermon lasts twelve minutes only. Provision shops are open in the middle of the day. At dusk, "the roads leading from the different places of suburban resort are crowded with people on their return home" (*Reprinted Pieces*, "Sunday as it is"). This description dates from 1836. Probably large sections of the population were as "unchurched" as they are to-day. Mr Young (p. 64) thinks that more than half the population in 1851 "went somewhere." He quotes Lord Shaftesbury as saying that only 2 per cent. of the great underworld went anywhere. The world described by Dickens is largely underworld and certainly the Church seems to play a negligible hand in its life. In 1851, again, there were said to be 70,000 communi-

[1] Compare Hipcroft in Hardy's *The Fiddler of the Reels*, who in 1847 walks from Wessex to London, "one of the last of the artisan class who used that now extinct method of travel."

cants in the diocese of London, out of a population of 2,000,000, a slightly smaller proportion than to-day. It is significant that the holy communion is not, I think, mentioned in the pages of Dickens.

But the Church in his novels is always there, in the background. The church clocks are always striking. Weddings in gloomy city churches abound. The only intellectual difficulty I have been able to find mentioned is the often too optimistic phraseology of the burial service (*Our Mutual Friend*, chapter x). The presuppositions of Evangelicalism are not shaken, though its sometimes unlovely manifestations are satirized. The non-churchgoers of Dickens may forget God, but they do not doubt His existence.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Havelock Ellis—Philosopher of Humanism

Havelock Ellis, who died on July 8th, had come to occupy a unique place in English thought. It is almost half a century since the French man of letters de Gourmont described him as "the most advanced man in England," and this verdict has since been re-echoed with approval by both H. L. Mencklin and Dr Inge. The range of his studies, *belles lettres*, psychology, French literature, Spanish culture, was astounding. His short essays, *My Confessional* and *Questions of Our Day*, did much to shape educated public opinion. He was a true product of the later nineteenth century, a combination of scientist and mystic. Like his contemporary, Edward Carpenter, he passed from Christianity through scepticism to mysticism as the only avenue which could lead away from the mechanistic universe of the post-Darwinians. For this reason, it is true to say that Havelock Ellis became one of the significant philosophers of his day. The high tribute which he has received from clergymen of mystical interests, such as Dr Inge or Dr Geikie-Cobb, is a strong suggestion that his influence is widespread. The part which humanism has played in much popular thought lends an added importance both to its foremost English expositor and to the wide circulation which his books have obtained. Ellis cannot be swept aside as irrelevant. Indeed,

for those who, unlike himself, desire to retain the Christian name he presents a challenging position deserving of analysis and answer. He represents, in personal form, the humanist alternative to the Christian Gospel.

The course of his religious thinking was typical of many of his generation. Reared by a mother of earnest yet narrow Evangelical views, he accepted her faith until the age of fifteen, seeking to lead " the religious life." To him, this meant an attempt to adjust himself to the universe in the light of his religious teaching rather than any interest in doctrine or ceremonial. School life left no mark upon him and ill-health drove him to the backwoods of Australia, an important period of meditative thought. In a remarkable essay Havelock Ellis has claimed that these were years of intensive religious experience. His Evangelicalism was dropping away. " Then came the period of emotional and intellectual expansion when the scientific and critical impulses began to germinate. . . . To inquire, to question, to investigate the qualities of the things around us and to search out their causes, is as native an impulse as the religious impulse would be found to be if only we would refrain from exciting it artificially. In the first place, their scientific impulse was not greatly concerned with the traditional body of beliefs which were then inextricably entwined in my mind with the exercise of the religious instinct. . . . I realized that it was possible to present in an attractively emotional modern light religious beliefs which were incompatible with Christianity, and even actively hostile to its creed."[1] The process of disintegration took place in slow stages, and was finally completed by a loss of any religious faith. To Ellis, this period had a value for later constructive thinking. " The man who has never wrestled with his early faith, the faith that he was brought up with and yet is not truly his own—for no faith is our own that we have not arduously won—has missed not only a moral, but an intellectual discipline." As a youth, Ellis now turned to science, only to find his religious emotions starved. The narrowly scientific theology of D. F. Strauss was a revelation of limited and prosaic ideals—" the enjoyment of Haydn's quartets and Munich brown beer." James Hinton, a thinker giving a significant combination of science and religion, provided the groundwork of religious reconstruction

[1] Ellis, *The Dance of Life* (essay on The Art of Religion).

for Ellis. His mechanism was that of a living universe and not of the factory. Through Hinton, he found a new relationship towards the universe. "My self was one with the Notself, my will one with the universal will. I seemed to walk in light; my feet scarcely touched the ground; I had entered a new world."

This new world thus became the home into which he wished to guide contemporary opinion. The problem of the soul and its destiny, the existence of superior being or beings, troubled him no longer: "All the words and forms by which men try to picture spiritual realities are mere metaphors and images of an inward experience." Dogma is a shadow which may be neglected by any who possess the substance. Ellis had reached a rational mysticism by way of a genuine religious experience. A medical course, linked with wide diverse reading, served to co-ordinate his thinking and to provide him with a message of the highly ethical humanism of which he was destined to be the prophet for over half a century, that life must be lived to the full, being used to develop those values which are inherent in the personality.

The idols of the Victorian market-place had received a rude shock. Whilst counselling moderation in political matters, Ellis reminded his readers that sex, the harmony of man and woman, is one of the important guides to life, falling under his rule for living. His earliest detailed researches were given to this problem. A shocked country prosecuted his bookseller, and Ellis, always like Goethe a man of the study, became aloof from social life, though still advising such of his fellows as cared to listen. To them he explained, though he did not excuse, Casanova as a man abnormal yet heroically natural. Ellis himself had diagnosed the failing of Victorian middle-class England. It leaned to the mechanical side of life, missing the finer joys of living, "sincerity, intelligence, sympathy, grace."[1] Anthropology was used by him to recall that accepted ethical inhibitions should be regarded in the light of the taboo, the old dying when it is no longer required in order to allow room for a new set of taboos which shall survive so long as they fulfil a social purpose. Protest and censorship are the last dying gasp of the generation which is just passing away. Whilst the old licence passes with the old

[1] Ellis, *Affirmations*, pp. 130, 224 *ff.*

taboos, discipline is always necessary in the form of a self-discipline of internal and personal taboos. The truly moral man is not the person fulfilling the taboos of society but he who develops such a self-discipline as to bring him into harmony with the universe. In the last resort, the art of living consists in a harmonizing of the self-discipline from within with a new conformity begotten of a new social solidarity. Such conflict and harmony are to be found at the heart of life and make the task of living more difficult for the pioneers.[1]

Conflict lies at the roots of all life. Ellis complains against any pacifism which ignores this fact, though he regards the pacifist as a necessary protest against such violence as would disorganize the tension of the moral conflict. Life may be portrayed under the outward form of a dance. Harmony implies the rhythmatic as its highest expression. But the dance of life is a dance which includes pain, conflict, suffering, and which must consider such factors as individualism, socialism, eugenics, the place of woman in society, in order that life may reach the highest perfection and rhythm of the ritual movement. *The Task of Social Hygiene* is a volume in which the author has stated the practice of his theory of living outlined in *The Dance of Life*. Ellis had entered into dispute with a generation which was still without his understanding of man and his purpose. He was seeking to transcend the stage when man confuses his ideals with his laws. The sight of bishops linking up the Christian message with laws and law-making roused his anger.[2] He is scornful of the ecclesiastical dignitary who could say that the silencing of the church bells of England was the most serious outcome of the war.[3] But he is not disrespectful to Christianity. The figure of Jesus "symbolizes, and will always symbolize, a special attitude to life, made up of tender human sympathy and mystical reliance on the unseen forces of the world."[4] The rites of the Catholic Church symbolize men as the masters of life inasmuch as, by an appreciation of the symbol, they have penetrated to the meaning of the ritual dance. Prayer, when it is caught up in the tension of faith that it will help and also that faith requires no answer, has not lost its value. Death

[1] Ellis, *More Little Essays on Love and Virtue*, pp. 97 *f.* [2] Ellis, *Impressions and Comments*, July 9, 1914. [3] *Ibid.*, November 25, 1919. [4] Ellis, *Affirmations*, p. 212.

is to be conquered by that love which it is the part of humanity to bestow. "We create by love an immortal being whom nothing can destroy until we, too, are turned to dust."[1] It cannot be claimed that such a faith is Christian, yet it must be urged that it is a reaction specifically religious from the mechanistic materialism which dominated much later nineteenth-century thought. It may also be claimed that, in substance, the religion of Havelock Ellis is a considered statement of the thoughts of many contemporaries. In an age when supernatural religion is declining in the number of its adherents, it is humanism of this type which is taking its place in many minds. The question which the Christian critic is compelled to answer is whether such humanism does full justice both to the religion of the New Testament and to the facts of living as they present themselves in the modern world.

To the Christian, Havelock Ellis stands for an alternative theory of life. The Pauline view of life in this world is not that of a ritual dance but of the pilgrim. The two views have some points of contact, for a dance must be trained and disciplined in order to be achieved with success. Both see the need for conflict and suffering. But the difference is far-reaching, as may be seen from St Paul's description of life as a pilgrimage. It presupposes that the achievement of the disciplined life will be far more than a realization that it is good to have lived, for it presupposes an eternal goal. The New Testament reaches a realization that the application of eternal ideals to life in this world will be marked by imperfection and by a falling short of realization. It is never optimistic with regard to the fate of man in the world apart from the constantly creative act of God. It is at this point that it is continually parting company with humanists of the Havelock Ellis type. It stands for a morality based upon the revelation of God as its final sanction and not upon the human intuitions of man. Ellis finds his sanction in a rational mysticism. His logical forbears are the humanists of the Renaissance epoch. He has a mystical approach to the achievements of the human spirit which shows him as the lineal descendant of Colet and Erasmus. He refuses to speculate beyond the confines of his science, but he is willing to erect a philosophy using science as his basis, a fact which makes Havelock Ellis to be far more than a pure scientist. His mysticism

[1] Ellis, *Impressions and Comments*, August 22, 1918.

at times affords a vivid reminder of the " dæmon philosophy " of Goethe, which Professor Tillich has recently revived, for the man who could take a faultless part in " the dance of life " would indeed possess qualities which raised him high above his fellows. But the philosophy of Havelock Ellis meets difficulties when it attempts to explain itself. It is difficult to grant to " love " and to " the unseen forces of the universe " the place which he would desire for them without likewise allowing a state in which they " live, move, and have their being," which yet transcends these qualities. If Jesus is the symbol of such forces, and if such forces derive their inmost meaning from their transcendental quality, then He likewise transcends the centuries and reveals a constant attitude towards both the Eternal and to man which refuses to be relegated to any one century. The Incarnation, which Ellis disregards, is demanded in explanation. Once again does a philosophy find itself in difficulties over the answer to be given to the question, " What think ye of Christ ?"

Nor is this the only difficulty which the humanist thought of Ellis will present to the Christian. He has told much of man and of his duty in his ethical and social relationships. He has explained famous individuals and has called attention to the extent to which certain individuals have come near to achieving their own highest ideals. He is a social Pelagian. But, in the last resort, such humanists are doomed to frustration. As J. B. S. Haldane—no Christian believer—has remarked, there is no evidence to show that course of moral progress within the history of the human race which was so beloved of the Victorian idealist, such as T. H. Buckle or W. E. H. Lecky. The history of mankind does not show any line of social moral development in a continuous progressive evolution. The history of morals is largely a history of individual striving and corporate backsliding. In this sense, the ritual dance of humanity is still full of mistaken steps and is no nearer achieving perfection. Ellis is impaled upon the dilemma which defeats finally all philosophies of humanism. Into such a philosophy the Christian Gospel of God, as the only final reality of grace and of redemption, breaks as a beacon-light of hope. Humanism shows itself as insufficient to explain the complex reactions of individuals or of individuals in society. It is not powerful enough to secure the attainment of its own highest ideals.

Much that Ellis has written of "conflict" is true. It brings him into accord with all of the greater moralists. But it is significant that he was lacking in any philosophy of crisis which was worthy of the name and in any real conception of the realm of ends. He was an individualist and he refused to face the real question which must follow the corporate drama when the dance of life reaches its final close. Too sound a scientist to be beguiled by such Shavian speculations as those of the superman, he passes the question without answering it. Yet no philosophy can afford to treat the issue of the soul and its destiny, or of eternity and time, with a mere shrug of the shoulders and an expression of lack of interest. It is significant that Ellis was not alone in his silence. Much the same might be urged with regard to the humanists of modern America. Yet one fact must be stressed. The morality against which Ellis was contending was a debased morality based upon a Christian ethic which had compromised. Whatever may be thought of the naturalistic morality of Ellis, it is at least a challenge to Christianity to desert any form of compromise between the Church and the world for a return to the moral idealism of the New Testament.

Some tribute, however, must be allowed to Ellis by Christian thinkers of the present time. His closely reasoned demand that the dance of life should be brought into strict relationship to the actualities of daily life may have failed merely because humanism is insufficient to explain daily life in its many ramifications of the whole of the apparently inexplicable actions of mankind. But it is a warning against any form of religion which would detach itself from daily life or which would sacrifice man upon the altar of an anti-humanist theology by crucifying his reason. Again, his attitude to dogma is important. The truth that dogma is but the shadow of the reality which underlies it, that no finite definition can comprehend the whole of infinite truth, is one which is in a constant need of reiteration. Above all, Ellis has shown the need for every man to reach an understanding of his dogmas and to define them in the light of his own conscience. "We are beginning to realize that there are no metaphysical formulas to suit all men but that every man must be the artist of his own philosophy. As we realize that, it becomes easier than it was before to liberate ourselves from a dead metaphysics, and so to give free play alike to the religious and the scientific instinct.

A man must not swallow more beliefs than he can digest; no man can absorb all the traditions of the past; what he fills himself with will only be a poison to work to his own auto-intoxication."[1] It may be suggested that some of the criticisms which have been levelled at the Doctrinal Report illustrate the truth of Dr Havelock Ellis's words.

It was as an ethical philosopher that Ellis excelled. Whilst it must be admitted that, from the Christian standpoint, all naturalistic theories of ethics stand beneath the divine judgment, yet it is clearly a Christian duty to seek to secure that, within the confines of this world, the standard of personal conduct and of social relationship exhibited will be that of man at his best, however far short that best may fall from divine standards of perfection. Havelock Ellis and his little band, the " Fellowship of the New Life," who both shocked and fascinated the England of the eighteen-nineties, certainly succeeded in introducing a higher note into ethical standards by the sweeping away of repression and by its replacement with an ethic based upon the fulfilment of the individual personality. Not only was Ellis's book *The Criminal* a pioneer in the science of penology, but it was a definite attempt to trace crime to its root-causes, which are only to be found in an understanding of the personality and its development. His studies in sexology and his *A Study of British Genius* pursue the same line of approach. He swept aside the conventional ethic which had been erected upon the debased Christian ethic common in the West, an attempt to blend high idealism and moral courage with law and custom. Not only had religion been largely abolished from the workaday world, but prejudice and taboo had taken the place both of rationality in conduct and of discipline of the self as its governing factor. Victorian prudery was the last victory of the debased Hebraic strain in Puritanism with its lack of ethical toleration. It represented the outstanding victory of the middle classes. In overthrowing this victory, Havelock Ellis and the " Fellowship of the New Life " put English society deeply into their debt. They made possible the widespread ethical readjustment and consideration of social relationships which were to emerge into such a movement as the Fabian Society. This process is a constant warning that, if religion ignores its social obligations, advanced opinion will turn elsewhere for its inspiration, just

[1] Ellis, *The Dance of Life*, p. 218.

as it is a reminder of the inevitable sequel if Christian ethics are degraded, compromise supplanting moral idealism.

Havelock Ellis deserted an Evangelicalism which was erected upon far too narrow a basis to command intellectual assent, but he retained from the days of his upbringing an intense concern for individual thoughts and emotions. His philosophy, however, represents the final defeat of humanism. The optimism which it implies with regard to human moral achievement is not sanctioned by the history of moral ideas. In part it may be suggested that he failed to take notice of the solidarity of the human race, just as his reflections upon religion showed a strange omission of any real understanding of the meaning of the Catholic Church—a further legacy of the religion in which he was reared. But the most serious indictment of his humanism, as of all humanism, is that it fails to explain the constant crises and defeats which occur both in the human soul and in society as a whole. It is too ready to ignore the fact of sin and the human need for redemption. When the hopes and understandings of Havelock Ellis, his faith that, with the fulfilment of his personality, man will achieve an ever-closer perfection in the ritual dance, is compared with the Church that is preaching the Gospel of the New Testament, " the citadel of hope set on the edge of despair," there can be small doubt as to which approaches the closer to an understanding of man or to the more complete view of his origin, purpose, and destiny, problems which must be answered before the fulfilment of the personality can represent a coherent and complete aim. In the end, humanism represents a reminder to the Christian that, whilst any religion which crucifies the values inherent in humanity is at best a one-sided presentation, yet those elements of personality demand grace and redemption before they can attain full worth. In other words, the pilgrimage back must be traced from Havelock Ellis and his fellow-humanists, who see this world as self-sufficient, to the transcendentalism of St Paul.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. G. F. S. Gray is on the staff of the Central Theological School at Peiping, China.

Miss Redpath has made a special study of Dante.

The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger is Fellow and Tutor of the General Theological Seminary, New York.

Dr Lowther Clarke is the Editorial Secretary of the S.P.C.K.

The Rev. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright is the Senior Curate of Hammersmith parish church.

Dr Gutbrod of Tübingen University recently spent a year at Westcott House, Cambridge.

Dr. Shirley is a Canon of Canterbury Cathedral and the Headmaster of King's School, Canterbury.

The Rev. L. J. Collins is Fellow and Dean of Oriel College, Oxford.

The Rev. C. K. Sansbury is British Chaplain at Tokyo and is on the staff of the Central Theological College of the Anglican Church in Japan.

NOTES

From this month onwards Theology will be on sale at Messrs W. H. Smith and Son's principal shops and bookstalls. It can, of course, be *ordered* through any bookseller, or is obtainable direct from the publishers for 12s. per annum, post free.

JESUS AND THE LAW—SOME CONSIDERATIONS

It is a well-known fact that, in the Synoptic record of the teaching of Jesus, there are to be observed, at one and the same time, both a negation and an affirmation of the Law. Naturally enough, various attempts have been made to discover, by some method of rearrangement, one single, consistent line of thought, and so to obviate this apparent contradiction. The different aspects of Jesus' attitude to the Law are traced to different sources, or assigned to different periods in His ministry, it being supposed, in the latter case, that a development took place and that His attitude towards the Law became increasingly more free.

Such attempts have on the whole failed to prove very convincing, mainly because they invariably involve a great deal of emendation and rearrangement of the existing texts. It therefore seems to me to be necessary, first of all, to ask in what sense it is possible to speak on the one hand of the negation of the Law, and on the other hand of its affirmation, in the teaching and attitude of Jesus, and then to try to discover what inner link binds these apparent opposites together. It is not my

intention to undertake, in this paper, a comprehensive examination of the whole question of Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Gospels, but only to emphasize two main points which I believe to be of fundamental importance for this issue.

1. Jesus sets Himself in the place of the Law. In the Jewish religion the Law is the mediator between God and man—that is to say, man has his relation to God in his relation to the Law, whether in transgressing or in fulfilling it.[1] Jesus sets Himself in this mediatory position. Since He has come, man has his final relation to God in his relation to Jesus, to His word and His person, and no longer in his relation to the Law. A man's eternal fate is decided by his answer to the claim of Jesus.

This is the sense of the three parables in Luke xv, for instance, as verses 1 and 2 suggest. When the publicans and sinners hear Jesus and He "receiveth them and eateth with them," the lost sheep or the lost piece of silver is found and the prodigal son has returned to the father's house. The second part of this last parable (vv. 25 *ff.*)—which, according to verse 2, seems to bear the main emphasis—shows how this fact creates a new situation, not only for those who are lost, but also for those who, like the elder son, have remained in an attitude of obedience to the father. The elder son now has to prove of what kind his obedience is, whether he is really obedient in unselfish love, glad that the brother who was dead is alive again (v. 32), or whether his attitude is to be understood as one of hard, joyless work that makes him envy his lost brother's salvation.

It is possible that the parable in Matt. xxi, 28 *ff.* is in origin the same parable, handed down in an entirely different line of tradition yet nevertheless preserving the same original meaning. Whether this be so or not, the parable is in any case to be understood only in the light of verse 31*b*. The publicans and harlots are the son who said "I will not" when the father asked for his obedience. But their adherence to Jesus is the point at which they "repented and went." The Pharisees are like the son who seems to be obedient but is really not obedient. It is by no means denied that the publicans and sinners are "lost," that the prodigal son is "dead," but the whole emphasis lies on the fact that in coming to Jesus they have a new start, they "live again."

But this fact, that Jesus puts Himself, instead of the Law, in the position that is decisive for the relation of man to God, is not evident only in these parables, but is everywhere presupposed in the Synoptic Gospels, as some further examples will serve to show. In Mark x, 32 *ff.* confession of Jesus, or denial of

[1] For further particulars on this point, as well as on the whole subject, I may be allowed to refer to my forthcoming article on νόμος in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, Stuttgart, 1932 *ff.*

Jesus, finally decides man's eternal fate in the judgment of God. It is precisely to those who are " heavy laden " under the Law and the transgression of it that Jesus gives His " rest " (Matt. xi, 28). It is precisely the man who is guilty before the Law but who asks only for the grace of God that " goes down to his house justified " (Luke xviii, 14).

The radical supersession of the Law through Jesus and His creation of a new existence of man before God by forgiveness of sins is the main link that connects the discourses in Mark ii, 1 to iii, 6. The authoritative forgiveness of sins (vv. 1 *ff.*), the manifestation of this forgiveness in the call of the publican to discipleship and of sinners to table-fellowship (vv. 13 *ff.*), the abolition of fasting for the disciples of Jesus as the friends of the bridegroom (18 *ff.*), the freedom of the disciples over against the sabbath law (ii, 23 *ff.*; iii, 1 *ff.*)—all this is possible only if it is no longer the Law that plays the decisive rôle between God and man, but Jesus Himself. Such is not only the presupposition but also the clear meaning of these passages. The picture of the bridegroom, and, still more, the saying about the new wine in old bottles, indicate that what is happening there is not only a revelation of something unknown, not only the removal of a misunderstanding, not only a new thought, but a new fact, *the* new fact. At the coming of Jesus the whole situation of the world has changed. The new age has dawned. The clearest expression of this is perhaps Luke xvi, 16: " The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Since in Jesus the Kingdom of God has come, the measure with which God measures is no longer the Law and man's performance of the Law.

These are some of the examples that show how Jesus bases the relation of man to God in man's relation to Himself and to the Kingdom of God that appears in Himself. When He calls sinners into a new fellowship with God He executes the negation of the Law that stood as the mediator between God and man. In the person of Jesus Himself the Law is displaced from its key position.

2. The second point upon which I wish to lay stress emphasizes the affirmation of the Law and the agreement of Jesus to the Law as the goodwill of God. In this connexion there are several important considerations that can only be mentioned: the fact that Jesus Himself is represented as keeping the Law, and that, in answer to his question, He tells the rich young ruler to do the same. More important still is the fact that in the very incidents and parables that have been mentioned above the judgment of the Law about men is not denied but affirmed: those who transgress the Law *are* lost, *are* dead. Furthermore, Jesus demands of those who come to Him a real obedience. The

son who had originally said " I will not " now not only repents but goes and does the will of the father (Matt. xxi, 19).

But there is, moreover, a critical attitude on the part of Jesus towards the Law, which is intended, however, to affirm and rebuild the Law as the goodwill of God. Jesus criticizes the Law in so far as it is used to protect man against the universal claim of God. He not only denounces the use of scribal tradition in order to avoid obedience to the fifth commandment (Mark vii, 7 *ff.*), but even puts this commandment aside if it is used in order to escape the call of Jesus (Mark viii, 21 *f.*). Or in Mark iii, 1 *ff.* with the question of good or evil—that is to say, with the question what is the will of God in the actual situation of the neighbour's want—is solved the question of what is allowed or forbidden on the sabbath. The lawyer in Luke x, 25 *ff.* wants to " justify " himself by asking who is my neighbour whom the Law bids me love, and the parable of the Good Samaritan turns the whole question round so as to exclude the use of the Law and its distinctions as a means of escape from the radical claim of love. Highly relevant to this, as the context in Luke shows, is the concentration of the Law in the great commandments (Mark xii, 28 *ff.*). This concentration is in no way meant to soften down the will of God as revealed in the Law, or to rationalize odd rules, but to radicalize God's universal claim upon the whole of man. Such simplification of the Law is certainly a criticism of the Law used as a basis for casuistry, but it is also a radical affirmation of it, or, better, a reduction of it to its original Old Testament sense (see note on p. 124), and especially to its original sense as emphasized by the prophets. The formula " Legalism contrasted with Morality " misses the point. It is the living and all-embracing will of God contrasted with restricted conception of His commandments. It is, moreover, to be observed that this critical affirmation of the Law by Jesus is in one other respect very similar to that of the prophets: it appears mainly in connexion with a call to complete repentance, a call that issues from the absolute will of God and from the fact that the absolute will of God is not done. In the case of Jesus, however, far more than in the case of the prophets, it is also a call to true obedience in new righteousnes.

3. But precisely at this point it becomes clear that this affirmation of the Law is quite inseparable from the fact that Jesus bases the relation of man to God, not on the fulfilment of the Law, but on the creative, forgiving act of God. He breaks through the formulated law to the direct and absolute claim of God, and so to the acknowledgment that man is condemned by this claim of God. This on the one side, and on the other side deliverance from the Law and its fulfilment as mediator between God and man, demand each other as indispensable conditions: in radically emphasizing the will of God and man's

condemnation by it, Jesus forces man to ask for the new creative act of God. In revealing Himself as this new creative act of God, in offering through relation to Himself the new relation to God, Jesus brings man to the new obedience to the will of God. So He fulfils the prophecy of Jer. xxxi, 31 *ff.* Herein lies the difference between the attitude of Jesus to the Law and that of the prophets, for He constitutes the new covenant for which they could only wait and yearn.

WALTER H. GUTBROD.

A DECLINING POPULATION?

(*Communicated*)

THE July editorial is a good start for a subject that bids fair to dominate English life in the near future. The facts are well known. Women of child-bearing age in Great Britain are failing to reproduce themselves by 25 per cent. That is, for every 100 women 75 are being born. A Government spokesman in the House of Lords said lately that little change was expected in the population in the next twenty years. That is true enough; but the average age will rise considerably. He went on to say that no system of family allowances could be introduced, because public opinion was not in favour of them.

That apparently in a democracy is final. What is not generally realized is that the insufficient birth-rate is to a large extent a peculiarity of democracy—Britain, France, Scandinavia, Australia, New Zealand, the Nordic stocks in the United States, the British stock in Canada. Nearly everywhere else the present stock is reproducing itself. A great increase in the birth-rate of Germany dates from the revolution of 1933 and the repudiation of democracy; it is being maintained and so does not seem to be due entirely to earlier marriages.

The chief argument against having children used in England is the economic one—we can't afford it. Yet our standard of living is so much in advance of that of most other countries as to cause jealousy.

The writer has recently seen a number of letters from young wives, which contain statements like these. Contraceptives nowadays are as much a matter of routine and hygiene as brushing your teeth. If the State wants babies, it must pay for them. (Whatever else this is, it is not democracy.) How can you expect me to have a baby when I can't get a maid?

This last must be taken seriously. Middle-class mothers can get a trained nurse to look after the baby, while they themselves do the housework. The rich childless couples, or old maids, take such servants as are still to be had. Whatever our views

of class distinctions, a woman has a right to expect help from another woman when she is bringing up a family. (It should be noted that middle-class people multiply their difficulties by segregating themselves in middle-class suburbs, where no daily help is available.)

But all the pressure of the State is exerted to turn working-class children into bourgeois. Teachers in State schools, consciously or unconsciously, set before the children their own conception of the good life. Officials of the Education Authorities advise the children as to careers, always with the idea of rising out of their own class if possible. We must reckon with the probability that middle-class standards will permeate the present working class.

One result of the present strike against parenthood is seen in the international situation, which is certainly aggravated by the sense of injustice felt by the increasing races against the soon-to-decrease races who control so much of the world.

There is little prospect of any appreciable improvement in the English birth-rate unless a new scale of values is established, especially among Christians, who at present seem to share the views of those among whom they live.

Long ago G. K. Chesterton started from the text of a little girl at school forced to cut off her long hair for sanitary reasons. The child must keep her hair, which is her glory. Therefore, she must be clean. To ensure this, poverty and the slums must be abolished. Well, this particular problem has solved itself in another way. But the same principle applies. The race must go on. Therefore the whole of English life must be drastically changed, to enable babies to be born and nurtured. In a democracy this is impossible unless someone takes the lead. And who is there except the Christians?

If this note should strike the eye of a bishop, will he reflect on the inevitable discussions which will arise at the Lambeth Conference next year? To attempt to reverse the Resolutions of 1930 would produce acrimonious controversy and probably end in failure. It would seem wiser to concentrate on a positive policy of urging all who will listen to play their part in co-operating with God in His work of creation. Refusal so to co-operate is apostasy and God's judgment will be clear enough in history.

"Except ye repent, ye shall perish."

CHRISTIANITY AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

It is a truism, constantly re-echoed from the pulpit and ecclesiastical platforms, that the hope of a genuine revival of Christianity in this country lies in the rising generations now being educated in our schools and universities. The decisive

struggle of the immediate future is between loyalty to the supreme and absolute authority of *God* on the one hand, and on the other either the materialism and self-seeking which are the curse of our democracy or the false racial and militant ideals of the totalitarian states. This conflict is already being waged openly in Germany and it must come to a head in England too, if English Christianity remains true to its profession. It is, under our present educational system, in the public schools and universities that the hardest battle for the Christian faith must be fought out, for they are the key positions. The strategic importance of the public schools has been admirably pointed out by Middleton Murry in his recent book, *The Price of Leadership*. In these schools the Church has at present the immense privilege and opportunity of being able to train the leaders of the nation as Christians, and thereby of rescuing the country from the evils of selfish materialism and the un-Christian ideals to which the youth of so many nations is devoting its allegiance.

Yet public-school religion is in many cases notoriously, and even proverbially, unsatisfactory; and in the universities it would generally be admitted that Anglican churchmanship is at a low ebb, comparatively speaking. Certainly the time is long past when religion provided the *raison d'être* of the older universities, and the modern foundations have rarely been anything other than purely secular in their outlook.

It should follow that the Church, recognizing the prime importance of real pastoral, educational, and—as is often most necessary—of actual missionary work among the young, should devote to this task the best of its resources; that is to say, priests of the highest intellectual ability and soundest knowledge of human nature. Yet in most theological colleges it seems taken for granted that the only proper work for a priest is parochial; and the opportunity offered by educational work for training Christian *leaders*, as against the rank and file with whom the parish priest has to deal, is often tacitly ignored. Indeed it is sometimes suggested to the ordinand, explicitly or by implication, that to take up non-parochial work is in some degree to shirk his pastoral duty. The Church's "front line" is generally supposed to be the slum parish. That, admittedly, is a post of great difficulty and discomfort; but it is deceptively easy to confuse discomfort with spirituality and difficulty with usefulness; and, beyond question, at the present time the real "front line" has shifted to the school and the college. The ablest men are required to occupy it, and the Church must surely make a far greater effort to dispose its man-power accordingly.

The clerical master has become a rare enough figure in school life. But it is essential that teachers of Scripture should have as good a specialist knowledge of theology as the training of the mathematician, scientist or classical master warrants

others to have. Otherwise " divinity " periods come to mean no more than the sketchy and slipshod teaching of the history of the New Testament period or part of the history of ancient Israel. At present, indeed, it often fails to achieve the level of intelligently studied history and is looked upon by masters and boys alike as a " soft option " for certificate examinations. Apart from the obvious difficulty at present of finding laymen with good degrees in theology, it is plainly desirable that the Christian faith should be taught by its accredited ministers; and a sound theological background is vitally necessary, not only in the classroom, but in all the aspects of school religion—a fact which was pointed out by Canon Charles Smyth in the June issue of THEOLOGY, and which is emphasized in the Spens Report.

But besides " divinity " it is important that other subjects should be taught, when possible, by clerical masters or by instructed Christian laymen. Particularly is this the case with history. It is impossible, and probably undesirable, for the teacher of history to avoid all bias; and it is better that the bias should be in favour of, rather than against, the Christian religion, particularly in view of the amount of wild, misinformed statements—and even of anti-Christian propaganda—to be found in popular histories, whose influence on the minds of those who have never heard the Christian case properly presented is most powerful.

In most schools to-day a remarkably large proportion of boys of sixteen and upwards abandon prayer and communion, and regard themselves as agnostics. In some cases, of course, they are passing through a normal and desirable adolescent stage of testing, and often for the moment reacting sharply against traditional beliefs in which they have been brought up, about which they are now seriously for the first time thinking. Such boys need, but do not always receive, real understanding of, and respect for, their doubts, sound advice and encouragement, and particularly to be directed to really good (but not too difficult) books on the matters concerning which they are endeavouring to form a judgment. Others are merely slack, or have moral rather than intellectual difficulties. With others the lack of Christian example set by parents and masters carries a great deal of weight. But the most potent causes of this attitude of revolt are: (i) The failure to distinguish between Christianity and the visible Church, considered either as a whole or merely as the part with which they come into contact at school or in their home parishes. They think the Church is ineffective to deal with the great problems of the modern world with which they will have to deal themselves, and they consequently abandon interest in religion. Obviously there is some good ground for this point of view, which is largely the fault of the clergy; but it is really based upon ignorance of the nature of the Church as

the Body of Christ, and consequently there is failure on their own part to realize their responsibilities as members of it. (ii) The general ignorance of the Bible and of the whole Christian faith, which is so appalling a feature of parochial life to-day, is widespread in most schools (where alone it could be satisfactorily dispelled), and the boys are left to face their own and other people's questionings and objections without any adequate means of response. They are often captivated by arguments which even a little knowledge would enable them immediately to refute—some of them quite remarkably childish. (iii) The artificiality and formalism of many services is more readily apparent to boys than to their elders who have grown accustomed to forms of words which are really unsatisfactory, and the effect of repeating prayers, psalms or hymns which are to them meaningless or unreal is enough to counterbalance any sound teaching they may be given. This applies, whether it be daily prayers or Sunday services; and the rapid and perfunctory recitation of the Lord's Prayer is, for example, a positive influence on the side of irreligion to which sufficient attention is very rarely paid.

As a result of all these things many older boys are prepared, as a matter of private personal ethics or general theory, to revere the " moral code " of Christianity, but without acknowledging the actual Lordship of Christ or realizing the nature of the Christian society or their own privileges and duties as baptized and confirmed members of it. Consequently the men produced by the public-school system are in no way fitted or competent to withstand the present drift towards the recognition of no other permanent ideal than the self-interest of the individual or the nation, and will generally be found on the wayside in the conflict between that tendency and the Christian religion. Youth, in fact, is being neglected in this country in spite of the unprecedented amount of lip-service now paid to it. The Church, in particular, seems to ignore youth's real needs and to content itself with organizing movements and rallies of various kinds which produce few permanent results. On the other hand, the totalitarian states, Communist and Fascist, are really succeeding in binding their young folk to the service of their ideals. Unless the Church can do the same, as effectively and as rapidly, though, of course, by very different means, it may well perish in the future.

It is, of course, easier to state the problem than to solve it, but some indications have been given above of the urgent need for the Church to give educational work far more serious attention than it at present receives, and the following is a brief sketch of methods which might be applied.

1. Foremost of all comes the provision of real religious education. In the classroom this must take the form of divinity periods at least as frequently held and as efficiently conducted as those in

history, geography or any other " secular " subject. A carefully constructed syllabus should be used, ensuring that all boys obtain an outline acquaintance with the contents of the Bible, and a detailed knowledge of at least one or two Gospels; and, for Anglican boys, the essentials of Church teaching, based upon the Creed and the second part of the Catechism, and the principles of worship. In the Sixth Forms a certain amount of good, though not too technical, theological works can be read and discussed, and the implications of Christian belief for social, political (in the wide sense), and moral questions studied. More can be done among these senior boys through discussion than through textbook work, and in the case, for example, of classical forms reading the Greek text, such wide discussion can be based upon the portion of the New Testament they are studying.

At present confirmation in public schools is often formal, and generally unsatisfactory. The question goes deeper than whether chaplain or housemaster shall prepare boys for it. Whatever the preparation, it is crammed into a few weeks, and is bound to be inadequate, especially when it is largely directed to an emotional experience—the gift of the Spirit—and at the same time to another spiritual crisis in the first communion. It is not surprising that boys tend to ask what the need for communion is when they have received this gift in confirmation or vice versa, and, indeed, the emphasis now laid on the gift of the Holy Spirit in confirmation goes far beyond the teaching of the Prayer Book on the subject, and comes near to implying a lack of belief in, or appreciation of, the true nature of infant baptism. Boys often feel disappointed when neither confirmation nor first communion seems to fulfil expectation; they have been prepared for a " crisis," " the greatest day in your life," and so on; they have expected the heavens to open, and the heavens have not opened. A little shock perhaps—later, communion a formality; later, some resentment—" it doesn't work." And, anyhow, they have generally passed through one or two critical years of adolescence without either, and naturally feel that they are scarcely necessary. Then, confirmation over, first communion experienced, they are often left with small pastoral care, and feel that their clergy have now " done the job " with them and have little more interest in them.

2. More and more I feel that the core of the trouble is the present age of confirmation; it is the wrong moment. I see a lot to be said for confirmation at eight to ten, or eighteen to twenty, but nothing for it at fourteen. It would be interesting to hear the view of a Christian psychologist. If confirmation is looked upon primarily as admission to communion, there is no good reason why it should not be administered as soon as a child has some degree of understanding about what holy communion means; and eight to ten is appropriate. A boy is then able to

pass the whole of his adolescent years in the full sacramental life of the Church, and can be saved from thinking of holy communion as an unnecessary additional spiritual exercise reserved for the specially pious. If, on the other hand, confirmation is regarded chiefly as the ratification of baptismal vows and the gift of the grace of the Spirit to perform them, it is better reserved until a later age—eighteen to twenty--when the boy will have had a chance to think out his faith. The latter view seems, in fact, the meaning primarily given to confirmation in the Prayer Book.

The best solution of this extremely difficult question of the right age for confirmation would seem to be the making of a real distinction between these two aspects of confirmation as we have it to-day. Admission to communion could be accorded when a child reaches "years of discretion"—that is, eight to ten—and should be preceded by preparation designed to instruct him in the meaning of the sacrament and in the primary Christian beliefs, explained in a suitably elementary way. Confirmation itself would then properly take place about the time of leaving school—eighteen or nineteen—and its natural preparation would be the whole of a boy's religious education. A boy of tender years taking his regular place as a member of the Christian worshipping community at the eucharist, and, on the other hand, a "senior," aged eighteen or nineteen, ratifying his baptismal vows and being confirmed, would alike offer an example of genuine practising religion rarely seen in schools to-day.

3. Long matins and sermon seem even more unsuitable in a school chapel than in the parish church. If the "parish communion" so successfully attempted in several parishes is impossible in a school—though it seems the best form of service—matins must be rendered more real to boys. Much can be done by substituting simpler and shorter forms of confession and absolution, replacing what are generally to schoolboys the artificial hyperboles of Tudor phraseology; the Venite can be cut down, and either it or the Jubilate makes a grand opening hymn of worship, if sung to a majestic chant; one psalm and one lesson are enough, if chosen with care, and discrimination needs to be used in the matter of "occasional" prayers.

4. Sermons can be of first-rate importance. If the preacher has ability to "get across" his matter to boys, length is a minor consideration. If plenty of real teaching is being given in school, it is more desirable for boys on Sundays to hear men from outside, who have a message and a varied experience, than the headmaster and chaplain whose voices are heard so often in the week. But such men are not easy to come by, and yet the situation demands that boys at school shall have the best. There must be, say, fifty priests in the Church with the gift of preaching acceptably to the young. Is not the position sufficiently serious that

such men be withdrawn from their present spheres, organized regionally as school missioners to preach in the schools of their region in frequent turn, to hear the confessions of boys reluctant to confide their troubles to resident chaplains, and in general effect to be Christian "liaison officers" between school and world?

5. More remains to be said, but in brief. School prayers or house prayers must be freed from artificiality, formalism, and the "fancy" note; hymns can excite a boy's sense of ridicule; some parts of ordinary services might be entrusted to the boys; a short period of silence for recollection at all services and prayers is more than desirable; practical work, in the shape of assisting in the School Mission or in boys' clubs and the like, gives point to what they are taught.

Lastly, boys *must* be kept informed of the active work of the Church, at home and abroad, in mission field and in slum, and in the concentration camps where Christian churchmen refuse to forswear their Lord, so that they may be persuaded to abandon their prejudice against Christianity as a religion of pious phrases which can accomplish nothing in an everyday world.

F. J. Shirley.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BAPTISMAL STATISTICS

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

The writer of a recent leading article in *The Times* (May 27) concludes his remarks thus: "Fears are sometimes expressed that the nation is becoming paganized; but there are encouraging statistics to show that during the last twenty-four years eighty per cent. of English children are brought to Christian baptism. A figure so high and constant is of reassuring significance."

While not questioning his statistics, an increasing number of clergy, who actually work in parishes, would be doubtful as to the conclusion which he draws from them; for if they signify anything at all, then it would seem to be not the Christianization of the masses, but the paganization of the State and—what is more sinister—of the Church as well.

Certainly in the majority of cases, the use of the sacrament would appear to be little more than a superstition, or a mere convention whereby a child receives a name. Even when on those rare occasions parents approach the font with a degree of knowledge,

it is difficult to relate what follows with baptism as understood in its scriptural sense, for it simply does not occur to them that they are committing their child to membership of a supra-national body, which exists for the one purpose of being the means through which God may establish His Sovereignty in every department of life.

If a father were asked to hand over his baby to some Communist society, he would know what that would imply. Not only would he himself need to be a convinced Marxist, but his most cherished wish would be that his child should be so imbued with Communist doctrines from its earliest years that it would, in all probability, grow up determined to dedicate its life to the furtherance of the party's aims. Christianity is equally opposed to the present order of things; its demands are even more exacting; its policy is essentially more revolutionary. Yet how many of our 80 per cent. of English parents are aware of this when they throng our fonts? How many, in point of fact, would really want their children to grow up convinced Christians, conscious of their dedication to a revolutionary Church and aware of its totalitarian demand upon their lives?

Of course there are obvious practical difficulties, and one is well aware of the strength of a merciful and not too stringent policy which sets store upon making "contacts" with non-church parents. Yet, when a number of clergy were recently asked for statistics, it was ascertained that approximately not more than 7 per cent. of parents were practising members of the Church at the time of the christening, and not more than 0·5 per cent. was "roped in" afterwards.

Hence a reform is long overdue, for nothing can serve as an excuse for the way in which bishops, priests and laity desecrate this sacrament to-day. Certain things can be done at once; others need careful consideration and would take time.

A

(1) An immediate ban should be placed upon popular baptism centres, and upon churches which ignore the Prayer Book regulations. For instance, in this diocese there is one church where approximately one thousand christenings take place annually—the rubrical precautions are disregarded and instead a fee of sixpence is demanded from each parent. If the Diocesan Synod dared to use its moral authority, such a state of affairs could be brought to an end within a week.

(2) All baptisms must take place in the parish in which the baby is born, unless the vicar sees reason for permitting otherwise. This would do something to restore the sense of membership of a community which manifests itself in every parish.

B

(1) Baptisms to take place only four times a year, on Sundays fixed by Convocation. Such services should be as public as possible, and tremendous care should be taken to emphasize the fact of a welcome into the worshipping community.

(2) Godparents and, above all, parents to be confirmed.

(3) During the six weeks before the Baptism Sunday, instructions to be given on the fundamentals of the Faith—*e.g.*, God; the Person of Christ; conversion; prayer; the Church; the sacraments. Parents to attend this course before the baptism of their first child, either before or after its birth.

Such a program might decimate the number of baptisms, but it would do something towards Christianizing the Church of England.

Yours, etc.,

MERVYN STOCKWOOD.

THE BLUNDELL'S SCHOOL MISSION,
BRISTOL.

THE CONDITIONS FOR A JUST WAR

DEAR SIR,

Mr Lewis's letter and Mr Mascall's reply have carried us forward a step in this perplexing problem, at any rate in their agreement that the methods of warfare employed cannot be left out of account, nor, as Mr Mascall implies, the methods *likely* to be employed. As regards the bombing of civilians, I think Mr Mascall is much more cautious about the intentions of the Government than the situation warrants. The utterances of responsible politicians—for example, the often quoted words of Lord Baldwin—surely leave little room for doubt that this abominable weapon is regarded as an inevitable, if distasteful, part of that defence which is bound to consist chiefly in offence.

Moreover, we frequently hear of the necessity of " getting in first," which means if it means anything that the upholder of a righteous cause cannot wait for the " aggressor " to start his campaign of " frightfulness " but must, if possible, anticipate his aggression, in which case there can be no question of submitting the quarrel to impartial judgment or of Christians being sufficiently equipped with knowledge of the true facts to assess the justice of the cause in which they are asked to fight.

If this is so—and it seems to me to follow from what our leaders themselves tell us—I submit that the deduction to be made is that which is made by the Pax group among Roman Catholics, of whom Fr Vann, in his excellent pamphlet " Commonsense, Christianity, and War," is a good representative—namely, that

under modern conditions *no war can be just* according to the definition given by Mr Mascall.

Fr Vann makes several subsidiary points, including the important reply to the "choice of two evils" argument which is epitomized in the saying of St Thomas, "A man may not commit one sin in order to avoid another." But the above is, I think, the principal thesis of his pamphlet.

What, I suggest, is needed is an attitude of *conditional* pacifism at this time. Arguments as to the justice of past wars or about theoretical pacifism as an attitude towards every use of force by the secular power are not likely to lead to any agreement and are largely beside the point in these critical times. What we need to determine is our attitude to an actual war as it might begin at any time and *as it would undoubtedly be waged* by any Government to-day, including our own. As to this *practical* issue some of us are quite clear—we regard such war as incompatible with our Christian profession and cannot take part in it.

Yours faithfully,

C. E. Goshawk.

St. Mary Magdalene's Vicarage
Sunderland.
June 7th, 1939.

SURVEYS

(A) SOME RECENT BOOKS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT

LITERATURE about the New Testament has in the past occupied a very considerable place in theological book lists. New Testament study has for many years been one of the chief interests of theologians. Whether or not that interest has now waned, there has been during the last six months a falling off in the number of books on this subject. This in itself may be a fact to be welcomed; I think it is true to say that for many scholars of the New Testament the present is a time in which to digest the work of past years and to adjust ourselves to the new situations created by form criticism of the Gospels and by problems raised by such men as Professor Dodd in his books *The Parables of the Kingdom* and *The Apostolic Preaching and its Development*. We are passing through a stage of transition in which we seek to sift out the wheat from the chaff of past harvests before passing on to cultivate new crops.

Of recent books two by E. Basil Redlich clearly reflect the spirit of this transitional period. The first is entitled *Form Criticism* (Duckworth, 5s.). The application to the Gospels of the methods of form criticism seemed at first to have undermined not only the work of preceding generations, but also the worth of the Gospels. Some men were led to welcome uncritically the conclusions of radical form critics as well as their methods. Canon Redlich has helped to clear the air somewhat; not only does he give us, briefly and simply, a clear exposition of what is involved in the form criticism of the Gospels, but also he has suggested where is its strength and where are its weaknesses.

The second book to which I refer is *An Introduction to the Fourth Gospel* (Longmans, 5s.). This small volume is well constructed. Canon Redlich reviews past works on the Fourth Gospel and comes to the conclusion that evidences against the traditional view of Johannine authorship are insufficient to justify us in disregarding the tradition. Whether or not we agree with the author we shall be repaid for reading the book; the whole problem of the Fourth Gospel, its authorship, its historicity, and its interpretation, remains still open.

In the same context of questioning past conclusions and methods of New Testament critics we should note two books written recently by members of the Roman Church. Non-Roman students of the New Testament have for too long been accustomed to neglect the works of Roman scholars. In a period when the results of source criticism were taken as axiomatic truths and eighteenth-century views about history and revelation were unquestioned, it was natural to suppose that Roman

theologians could have little of value to tell us about the New Testament. But it is again possible to consider whether the interpretations of Scripture approved by the Church may after all be correct. Furthermore many Roman scholars are noteworthy for their wide knowledge of the variety of theories propounded by modern critics and for their accuracy and detail in scholarship. I would, without committing myself to their conclusions and without appraising their habit of sometimes seemingly twisting evidence in favour of particular solutions of New Testament problems, fully recommend *A Two-Year Public Ministry*, by E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J. (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 7s. 6d.), and *Introductio Specialis in Novum Testamentum*, by P. Benno Gut, O.S.B. (A.L.C.I., Rome, 30l.).

A field of New Testament study which has been too much neglected is that of the Jewish background of the Primitive Church. It is satisfactory to note that more attention is now being given to this subject. It is as important, if not more so, that the New Testament scholar should be acquainted with the Palestine of the time of Jesus, its political, religious, and topographical conditions, as with the Hellenistic world. But whereas the latter has been well considered, the former has received but scant attention except from Jewish scholars. *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus*, by Ch. Guignebert (translated by S. H. Hooke, Kegan Paul, 21s.), does much to redress the balance. It is impossible in this survey to do justice to the worth of this book. It is a really valuable contribution to the study of the New Testament and may be used as a textbook on those points with which it deals.

Another book, *Archæology and the New Testament*, by S. L. Caiger (Cassell, 5s.), is evidence of an increased interest at the present time in the archæological background of the Gospels and of the Epistles. An understanding of the setting in which the Gospel was first preached is greatly assisted by the work of archæologists; and Mr Caiger's little book is useful in this respect.

Several books of a devotional nature have appeared in the last six months. Among them we may note four. Volume I of the Westminster version of the New Testament, *The Synoptic Gospels*, by Monsignor Joseph Dean (Longmans, 10s. 6d.), is attractively arranged and is well annotated by the editor; it also has an introduction which readers should find helpful. *Readings in St John's Gospel*, by the Archbishop of York (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.), will be found very useful for devotional purposes. But the introduction, I think, might well have been omitted; the problems raised are too big for the very slight treatment they receive. *The New Testament: A Reader's Guide*, by C. A. Alington (Bell, 5s.), aims at giving ordinary men and women in their

reading of the New Testament for devotional purposes an understanding of it in the light of modern biblical criticism.

Of the fourth book I would say a special word of recommendation. *The New Testament Shortened* (S.P.C.K., 4s. and 2s. 6d.) is a book of excerpts from the New Testament arranged by W. K. Lowther Clarke. It is charmingly illustrated, and that fact, together with the simplicity and the excellence of its arrangement, should make it specially suitable for use in schools.

L. J. Collins.

(B) TRENDS OF THOUGHT IN JAPANESE CHRISTIANITY

Christianity has come to Japan along many channels. The stream of Christian thought and life to-day, therefore, is a complex one, and some knowledge of the historical background is necessary to understand contemporary movements.

First in point of time come the work and influence of the Roman Catholic Church. The story of Catholic missions dates back to the year of the first English Prayer Book (1549), when St Francis Xavier and a Japanese convert landed at Kagoshima. Welcomed by the authorities who saw in Christianity a unifying force that might counteract the dissensions of Buddhism, the Church grew until in the early years of the seventeenth century it had, it is estimated, 750,000 adherents. By that time, however, a change had come over the attitude of the authorities, due in part to the tyrannical régime of the Shogunate, in part to rival intrigues within the Church between Spanish Jesuits and Portuguese Franciscans, in part to the strong, if mistaken, suspicion that missionary work was merely the forerunner of Western imperialist expansion. In 1597 there took place the crucifixion of the Twenty-Six Martyrs, and in 1637-8, with the Government's defeat of the Shimabara rebellion Christianity was practically exterminated. For two centuries the Christian religion was banned and Japan remained a closed country. Nevertheless, through all that period the apostolic succession of faith continued, and with the arrival of French missionaries in 1859 secret believers numbering about 50,000 came out into the open and confessed the faith to which their families had clung for over 200 years. It is an epic story of heroic fidelity.

The tangle of Christian faith, civil rebellion and Western imperialism which brought the Church to disaster in the seventeenth century, however, has remained a dreaded memory in Japan and has seriously hampered the work of the Roman Church, and indeed of all Christian bodies, in modern times. The Roman Church, nevertheless, like the other bodies, has made slow progress and to-day perhaps is the most favoured

Christian body in official circles. Not only does its membership include a number of high-born and influential Japanese, but also it is felt that, as Fr Taguchi has put it, " a profound relationship exists between our Japanese mentality and Catholic ideals. Both lay the greatest stress upon nature, the law of nature: both are averse to unlimited liberalism and modern individualism. Both regard Communism as against human nature." The decision of the Holy See permitting Roman Catholics to bow at the state shrines as a patriotic duty has removed one serious cause of friction, while the feeling in the army that the Roman Church can be a useful instrument of pacification in the occupied areas of China has led the authorities to treat the Church with consideration and respect. The Roman Church has just over 100,000 members. It is the largest individual Church, though its numbers are less than half those of the combined forces of non-Roman Christianity. Its policy of exclusiveness means here as elsewhere that the riches of Catholic thought and devotion are undiscovered country to most Protestant Christians.

The second great stream of Christian influence in Japan is that of American Protestantism. It was an American, Commodore Perry, who caused Japan to emerge from her long isolation. America lies just across the Pacific Ocean, and it is natural that Americans should have been among the leaders in introducing to Japan the science and thought and religion of the West. Thus it has been through the work of American missionaries that there has been established the Presbyterian, the Congregationalist, the Baptist and the Methodist Churches (though Canada has had a notable share in the last-named) and other smaller bodies. The early missionaries of these Churches were, of course, orthodox Protestants of the Reformed or Evangelical traditions. Their preaching was that of salvation through the Cross of Christ, their attitude to the Bible pre-critical, their conception of hell-fire not entirely free from literalism. Meanwhile, Japanese intellectuals were largely under the sway of men like Darwin, Huxley and Spencer. When, therefore, in 1887 Unitarian missions arrived and liberal theology began to be propagated, many in Japan felt that orthodox Protestantism was discredited. Certainly the violent controversies within the Protestant Churches that followed proved a great set-back to missionary expansion and nearly brought disaster to the Christian University of Doshisha in Kyoto. Since then these Churches have revealed every variety of theological thought from fundamentalism to advanced modernism. For the most part they tread a middle road and (so far at least as their foreign staff is concerned) are more occupied with what the Germans call " activism "—evangelistic programs, rural reconstruction, educational projects and the like—than with theology.

The Protestant Churches have had a wide social influence. Such movements as those for the abolition of licensed prostitution, for temperance, for the raising of the status of women and the introduction of women's suffrage, for peace and international understanding, are the fruits of Christian idealism originating for the most part in the Puritan tradition of American Protestantism, modified and expanded by the " Social Gospel " of men like Walter Rauschenbusch.

Two further channels along which Christianity has reached Japan must be noted. The first is that of the Russian Church. Unlike the other Churches, which have had many workers, the Orthodox Church is the result of the apostolic labours of one man, Archbishop Nicolai, aided by never more than two or three assistants. Since 1917 the Church has been thrown entirely on its own resources financially, and to-day with shortage of funds and workers it is difficult not to feel that, despite the self-sacrificing work of the present Metropolitan, Archbishop Sergie, it is in a backwater. One could wish for a visit from someone like Fr Florovsky or Dr Zernov to bring the Church again into the main stream of Christian life.

The other channel is that of Anglicanism. The Nippon Sei Ko Kwai is the fruit of the missionary work of the American Episcopal Church, C.M.S., S.P.G., and the Anglican Church in Canada. Practically speaking, it is the only channel along which English Christianity is making any contribution to Japan. (English Nonconformity has left Japan to the sister-Churches of America.) In size the Anglican Church is less than a sixth that of the total non-Roman forces in Japan—40,000 as compared with 250,000. It is smaller than the Presbyterian Church (57,000) and the Methodist Church (46,000), about the same size as the Orthodox Church, and larger than the Congregational (32,000) and the Baptist (7,000) Churches. Thus the distinctive witness of Anglicanism to a Catholicism that is at once liberal and evangelical is made on a scale too small to influence very widely other Christian traditions. The Church too has tended in self-defence to become introverted. Even to-day it is not a full member of the National Christian Council, though it takes part in most of its activities. Its influence has perhaps also been limited by the fact that it has produced few great leaders. The first Bishop of Tokyo, Dr J. S. Motoda, is probably the only Sei Ko Kwai Christian comparable to men like Joseph Hardy Neeshima the founder of Doshisha University, Paul Sawayama the pioneer of " self-supporting missions," Kanzo Uchimura the independent and non-church theologian, Dr H. Kozaki of the Congregational Church, and Masahisa Uemura of the Presbyterian Church. By some Christians the Sei Ko Kwai is regarded as a Church that is neither fully Catholic nor fully Protestant, but by many it is thought of

here as well as at ecumenical conferences as the " Bridge-Church " and is respected accordingly.

So much for the background and present alignment of the Christian forces in Japan. What influences and trends of thought are to be observed in Japanese Christianity to-day?

First, the influence of the Barthian theology. Since 1931, the year of the Manchurian incident, the country has swung away from democratic and liberal ideals and from internationalism. The trend of thought and life has been increasingly in an authoritarian and regimented direction. Further, Japan has been living in a perpetual atmosphere of crisis, knowing that the world was against her and yet believing in her divine destiny and desperately conscious of her economic problems, for which expansion has seemed the only remedy. It is understandable, then, how the theology of crisis has made a deep appeal. Its opposition to liberalism, its dialectical approach, its demand for unquestioning obedience to the Word of God all fit in with the current mood.

Dialectical theology was introduced into Japan in 1927 by Professors Otsuka and Uoki of Doshisha and Professor Takakura of the Presbyterian Nippon Theological Seminary. But the real influence of the movement began to be felt with the translation of Brunner's *The Theology of Crisis* into Japanese in 1931. Thereupon Professors Kumano and Kuwada, both of the Nippon Seminary, publicly renounced modernism and declared themselves Barthians. With the translation of the works of Barth himself the movement has entered a new phase. While one group has continued in favour of Brunner, another has become 100 per cent. pro-Barth in the controversy over the relations of nature and grace and Brunner's doctrine of the " Point of Connection." One Anglican scholar, Professor W. E. Kan of St Paul's University, has made a complete change-over from a modernism that was practically unitarian to a whole-hearted acceptance of the full Barthian position.

The influence of the crisis-theology has led to a fresh study of Reformation theology. For instance, seven out of the twenty-six works on theology listed in the *Japan Christian Year Book* for 1938 as notable productions of the previous year were translations or original works dealing with aspects of Lutheran or Calvinist theology or with Reformed Confessions. The whole Reformation tradition lives anew in Japan to-day, and is finding expression not only in the scholar's study, but in the sermons and worship and general outlook of the Protestant Churches.

The second religious movement which has influenced Japanese Christianity in recent years is the " Oxford " Group. Its development has been largely within the Church, where it has brought direct spiritual renewal to many whose religious faith was in danger of being dissipated in the academic study of theology or

in social reform work. Its influence has been strongest in the Methodist Church, which has indeed almost been split into a Group and a social service section. The Group is now turning its attention to moral and spiritual rearmament and is directing its appeal to people outside the Churches. There is a danger here, unless the Group develops a coherent Christian theology. To challenge people whose conception of God is of the vaguest and may even be polytheistic to live a " God-controlled " life is to build on sand—or at least to be content with something akin to the " hands-across-the-sea " type of sentimental goodwill. The Group has done some fine work in bringing together Christians of different races here in the Far East, even amid the tensions and anguish of war—and for that all Christians must be thankful.

Thirdly, there is the movement for Church union. The inspiration of this movement came from Canada and the successful inauguration of the United Church there. If such union could take place in Canada, it was felt, why not in Japan? The first basis of union was drawn up in 1929 and provided for a simplified form of the Apostles' Creed as the basis of faith and for a constitution that should be " self-governing " and " constitutional." The Sei Ko Kwai had no part in this proposal but later took a full share in the work of the various committees. As a result the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed were named as the basis of belief, the two sacraments were explicitly acknowledged, the Bible was stated to be authoritative in all things necessary for salvation, and an overt reference to historic episcopacy was included. This basis, however, has not proved acceptable, and at the present time reunion efforts seem to have reached a deadlock. One reason is that Japanese Christians have carried over their old feudal loyalty into their Church membership. Denominational cohesiveness is strong. But deeper than that is the fact that (to quote the *Japan Christian Year Book* of 1937) " divergent convictions regarding the Church underlay all surface opinions " in the reunion discussions. The experience of Japan goes to support the conviction of many who attended Edinburgh, 1937, that reunion cannot come about without renewed study of the nature and meaning of the Church.

One further area of thought remains to be mentioned—the relation of Christianity to " kokutai," the national polity. To-day the authorities in their efforts to provide a spiritual foundation for the life of Japan are pressing with ever-increasing emphasis the unique nature of the national structure—that of a family united in mind and will and living under the fatherly rule of the Emperor, the descendant of an unbroken line of Emperors who trace their origin to the Sun-Goddess. The expression of that family spirit and national loyalty is to be found in acts of reverence offered at the state Shinto shrines, in humble

obedience to the imperial rescripts, and in unhesitating service to the Emperor and the nation whether at home or at the front. Such teaching, if pressed beyond a certain point, is obviously bound to lead to a clash of loyalties for the Christian with his faith that only God can claim an unquestioning obedience from men. It is safe to say that, while a few chauvinistic Christians are prepared to " Nipponize " the Christian faith to an unlimited extent, the great majority of Christian leaders realize keenly the grave issues at stake here. Nevertheless, they are not anxious to provoke a conflict. They share the pride of every Japanese in the national traditions, they desire to be fully loyal to their Emperor, they also are imbued with the sense of " Japan's great mission to bring peace and order in East Asia." Therefore, while they are watching the Confessional Church's struggle in Germany, they are doing nothing to reproduce it here. Even the full-blooded Barthians keep to the strictly theological side of his teaching and gently pass over his attitude to the State. But they are thinking a great deal more than they are saying. They desire to be fully loyal to God and the State and they see no reason at present why the two loyalties should conflict.

In conclusion, a word about Kagawa. One may regret his constant depreciation of doctrine: one may question the soundness of his " Brotherhood Economics." Nevertheless, he represents a passionate protest against the widespread tendency of Japanese Christianity to be occupied with purely academic issues in theology and to become a series of religious clubs for those already within the Church. Kagawa stands compellingly for the challenging of all facets of Japanese life and thought with the Christian Gospel, not only in word, but also in redeeming acts of love and service. It may be said without fear of contradiction that the Gospel will win the soul of Japan only in so far as Christians take to heart that central witness of one who rightly deserves the title of the apostle of modern Japan.

C. K. Sansbury.

Some leading theological works recently produced in Japan: Yuasa, *Revised Translation of the Old Testament*; Kotsuji, *Origin and Evolution of the Semitic Alphabets*; Murata, *Commentary on Romans*; Matsumoto, *Commentary on* 1 *Corinthians*, *New Testament Theology*; Sano, *Mysticism of the Apostle Paul* (influenced by Deissmann); Yamaya, *Theology of St Paul*; Kumano, *Eschatology and Philosophy of History*, *Fundamental Problems of Christology*, *Present-Day Theology*; Otsuka, *Introduction to Christian Ethics*; Hiyane, *Evolution of Japanized Christianity*.

Translations include works by Calvin, Brunner, Barth, Gogarten, A. B. Davidson, E. F. Scott, Melejikovski (this by Kagawa), A. Nygren, W. R. Matthews.

Bibliography for foreign students: M. Anesaki, *History of Japanese Religion*; D. C. Holtum, *The National Faith of Japan*; Otis Cary, *History of Christianity in Japan*; H. St G. Tucker, *History of the Episcopal Church in Japan*; T. Kagawa, *Christ and Japan*; W. Paton, *Christianity in the Eastern Conflicts* (Chapter I); H. Kraemar, *The Christian Message in a non-Christian World* (Chapters VI to IX); W. E. Kan, Article on " Karl Barth's Influence in Japan " in *Theologische Aufsätze*, a volume of essays dedicated to Barth on his fiftieth birthday, pp. 594-603.

Relevant articles in *Japan Christian Quarterly* and *Japan Christian Year Book* (both published by the Kyo Bun Kwan, Tokyo).

BOOK REVIEWS

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE: ITS THEORY AND PRACTICE. Edited by A. S. Nash. With a Foreword by the Archbishop of York. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

Canon Barry, in a sentence paraphased on p. 5 and misprinted on p. 297 of this book, has said that the Church gives the impression of being "more concerned to prevent people getting unmarried than to help them to be happily married." However this may be, there is certainly a growing realization on the part of churchpeople that the Church might do more than it is doing in the way of preparing men and women for marriage, and that (as the editor suggests on p. 11) the clergy ought to be trained for this ministry as universally as for the ministry of preaching. It is as a contribution to this end that this book has been published.

It cannot be hailed as an unqualified success. In spite of the editor's efforts to exhibit its contents as the coherent development of a balanced scheme of Christian teaching, the impression left on the reader's mind is that of a patchwork of essays, some good, some not so good, and some out of place, in which there is lacking that proportion of emphasis which is essential in the presentation of Christian thought.

It is doubtless true that most clergymen would regard themselves as already better equipped to give instruction in such matters as faith, prayer and worship than in the physiology and psychology of sex. There is, therefore, good reason for including in this book clear and detailed information on these latter subjects, as is done in the contribution by Dr G. L. Russell. But the general emphasis is such as to suggest that we must begin by learning about modes of physical union in order that our mastery of this art may have the psychological effect of setting our minds free to worship God. Not only is this putting the cart before the horse in all cases, but it is cruel to those married persons (and they are many) for whom no medical or psychological treatment can ever make possible the physical raptures that are here so enthusiastically described.

This is why Professor Otto Piper's contribution is out of place in this book. It is in itself an admirable essay, and would be most valuable in a symposium in defence of monogamy. But it is not really needed here, whereas there is great need at the outset for a paper on other lines. Christian marriage is a life of companionship in joint service of God and man, built on the foundation of the physical union. It is essential to remember that the foundation exists for the sake of the superstructure and not *vice versa*. What is needed is not an abstract and theoretical defence of monogamy, but a concrete and detailed exposition of

the part played by supersexual aims, purposes, and interests in Christian married life, so that Dr Russell's paper may be seen in the right perspective.

The three essays by the editor on the need of education for marriage, on methods of giving it, and on the importance to society of the family are all excellent, and Professor Dodd's treatment of " Marriage and the Family in the New Testament " is beyond praise. The book is worth buying for this paper alone. Dr Calver's paper on the psychology of growth in infancy and childhood makes a middle-aged reviewer reflect that his own parents and those of his contemporaries did all the things which nowadays are said to ensure children growing up askew. Either we must all be dottier than we imagine, or there is a screw loose in the argument somewhere. Mr Metman's contribution on the psychology of growth and development in adolescence and adult life suffers from the fact that it is apparently as difficult for the psychologist as for the theologian to write in language which will enable the ordinary man to see what he is driving at. Does he or does he not mean to contradict Article XXVI on p. 136? Miss Ikin supplies a paper on moral disease, sin and responsibility which is brief, but to the point and useful, and the same may be said of the legal and historical studies by Mr Wortley and Dr Borinsky—but is the former right in stating on p. 189 that deacons are legally qualified to celebrate marriages in the Church of England? Mrs Nash begins her paper on the home and the life of the nation with an interesting survey of different conceptions, but her positive contribution is too sketchy and assertorial to be of much use. The book ends with records of actual methods of education used by Canon Pym, the Rev. D. R. Mace, Dr A. H. Gray and Dr E. F. Griffith, and notes for a sermon by Canon Cockin. These all have the value of showing by example what can be and is being done.

The book does not claim to be more than a pioneer attempt at filling a gap which needed filling, and as such it is to be welcomed. Its editor is doubtless as fully aware as anyone of its defects; in this first attempt he has done the best he could with the material he was able to assemble. I hope he will be encouraged by the reception given to this book to try again, and it is for this reason that I have tried to suggest some constructive criticisms. And I should like to conclude by saying what a pleasure it is to find both the secretary and the accredited lecturer of the Church of England Moral Welfare Council adopting a sane attitude on the subject of birth-control.

Leonard Hodgson.

THE STUDY OF THEOLOGY. Edited by Kenneth E. Kirk, Bishop of Oxford. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s. net.

The contributors to this volume of essays are Professors N. P. Williams, E. O. James, Grensted, Danby, Dodd, and Hamilton Thompson, the late Professor Goudge, Fr D'Arcy, S.J., Dr Micklem, the Bishop of Oxford and Mr E. C. Ratcliff. It is in itself an event of no small importance in the history of theology when a team of eight Anglicans, two Free Churchmen and one Roman Catholic, all acknowledged masters of their various fields of study, can combine in a book of essays whose purpose is to explain to the educated layman or to the minister who wishes to continue his studies, " what is the underlying theory or scheme of ideas upon which the Christian religion is founded," and how those ideas are related to the historical origin and development of Christianity. Naturally each essayist is responsible only for his own contribution. But it may be said at once that there is no essay in the book which is not worthy both of the writer's own reputation and that of his colleagues, and that in spite of their differences of ecclesiastical tradition and personal outlook the contributors as a whole manifest a very real unity of system, summed up by Professor Williams in one of his admirably felicitous phrases as " critical orthodoxy," and inspired by the belief in a *philosophia perennis* drawn from the Platonic tradition.

It is here that I feel a certain difficulty. Modernism and Liberal Protestantism are declared to be dead and buried. But they were at least attempts to present Christianity in a form which would make it acceptable to the world at large except in so far as it deliberately preferred darkness to light. Can a system of " critical orthodoxy " and a *philosophia perennis* be more than the religion of a remnant, unless it bears in mind that in expounding the nature of God and His dealings with man, we may have to be content with a " probable myth " rather than with absolute truth ? I should like to share the certainty which this book expresses, but I do not feel that the matter is settled.

Subject to this question I have only minor points to criticize. Professor Williams is at his best in a brilliant summary of the whole field of Christian theology; but does he not go rather too far in rejecting the form-criticism of the Gospels as a whole on p. 35, while Professor Dodd accepts it as a method, without subscribing to all its presuppositions, on p. 240 ? Possibly Professor Williams really intends to reject its presuppositions rather than the method as a whole, but his language does not seem to mean this. Professor Dodd's essay is peculiarly good; in particular I should like to underline his suggestion that the alleged borrowings of Christianity from mystery religions are really borrowings from or adaptations of a philosophy common to all the religions of the Hellenistic age. I should have liked

to see in his bibliography a reference to Professor Nock's contribution to " Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation " on this point (I should also question Dr Micklem's statement that *kyrios* in the Pauline literature is drawn from Hellenistic sources, and that *teleios* means " initiate "). And must we not recognize that form-criticism reveals that the Gospel of St Mark is not a compilation of isolated units of tradition but a conflation of sources in which the units were already to some extent combined ?

Other points of criticism I should be inclined to raise are that Professor James is somewhat over-confident in his account of the relations of Orphism, Platonism and the Greek and Hellenistic mystery religions (perhaps inevitably owing to lack of space). Not for worlds would I venture to criticize Professor Grensted on the psychology of religion, but surely lines 1 and 2 on p. 173 have somehow been transposed ? I feel that there is a certain gap between Professor Danby on the Old and Professor Dodd on the New Testament; there are many allusions to the period between the Testaments, but I doubt whether enough attention is given to it. Professor Goudge's essay is a very welcome relic of a great teacher and shows his unfailing interest in the needs of the ordinary student, whether minister or layman; but it could be improved by an extension of the bibliography.

There is one deficiency which was perhaps inevitable. The Bishop of Oxford has made moral theology in the traditional sense his peculiar province, and he treats it admirably in his essay. But while he rightly points out that we need a branch of theology which discusses the minimum standards of Christian conduct, I should have liked to see an essay dealing with the possibilities of an ascetic theology which will seriously consider how the ordinary man can attempt to achieve the higher standards of Christian ethics in the world, and how such an attempt might be related to the economic and political difficulties of the age. But perhaps it would be impossible to break fresh ground in this field in a book of essays of this character.

I would conclude by urging all those interested in the study or teaching of theology to buy this book, which is of peculiar value in that it serves as a guide even to the specialist in one field who may wish to keep in touch with developments in other fields. If I have criticized details, it is because I hope and expect that it will run into fresh editions in which these points can be reconsidered. On the whole it is a remarkable and admirable achievement.

Wilfred L. Knox.

THE PERSONAL HERESY, A CONTROVERSY. By E. M. W. Tillyard and C. S. Lewis. Oxford University Press. 6s.

Mr C. S. Lewis is an Oxford lecturer in English literature who does not want us to take the poets too seriously. He holds that poetry is not about the states of mind of elect vessels called poets. It is about the subjects treated in the conversation of intelligent men. It is distinguished from prose in that it does not try to prove anything. Poetic language is not scientific or philosophic language, and it is not the language of intimate private conversation or letter-writing. " It preserves not primarily what excites love, but what contributes to amusement, entertainment, wisdom or edification; in fact those parts of conversation which are worth *repeating* " (p. 116). And it is good poetry when it is interesting, profitable, and enjoyable. He accuses the romantic critics of seeking to evade the consequences of a materialistic philosophy of life by finding in the poet's personality a last secretion of wisdom not of the flesh, a *faubourg* where the human soul " can keep a mock court in exile " (p. 29). And his shaft finds a home in the circle of Dr I. A. Richards, though it was odd of him to aim it at Mr T. S. Eliot on the strength of a quotation torn out of its context on p. 137 of *Selected Essays*, where it led on immediately to the conclusion that " the great poet, in writing himself, writes his time." This Dr Tillyard might have remembered when in reply to Mr Lewis he said of a passage in Mr Eliot's *The Rock*, " Here the style *is* the poetry. . . . It is entirely individual to the author, it reflects a poetical personality that quickens our pulses, and we value it far more than any heightened appreciation the passage may give us of the things of which it speaks." It is this kind of interest in modern poetry as expressive of peculiar personal attitudes (*e.g.*, those of Eliot and Lawrence) which are not very often possible in these days, that Mr Lewis is really attacking, and he might easily have turned and pointed out how unjust it is to the poetry itself. Instead he indulges in a half-concealed outburst of spleen against Mr Eliot's attitude to tennis, but this shows as much indulgence of Mr Lewis's personal proclivities as his " romantic and elegiac delight in the ruin and decay of greatness " when he listens to Isaiah's doom on Babylon. There Dr Tillyard feels " a quite individual ferocity of rhythm " belonging to " a Protestant divine writing not long after the Gunpowder Plot " (pp. 38-39). But this is no more than a parrying-stroke. The two critics chase one another round the bush, recording personal reactions. But they fail to discuss the image of grandeur and comfort crumbling away after the judgment of God. " And the wild beasts of the island shall cry in their desolate houses, and dragons in their pleasant palaces." " Their only monument the asphalt road, And a thousand lost golf balls." The poetry is in the words, but not

essentially in the far-away music of " courts where Jamshid gloried and drank deep," rather in the visual and auditory imagery of a decline and fall that is both particular and universal,

> " Falling towers,
> Jerusalem, Athens, Alexandria,
> Vienna, London,
> Unreal."

To Mr Lewis " The ' Dirty Twenties ' of our own century . . . succeeded in communicating moods of boredom and nausea." Perhaps they did so to Dr Tillyard, or perhaps they communicated some other mood. He does not say. To others they " reasoned of righteousness and temperance and judgment to come." But they are those who did not listen for a mood or for a pleasurable excitement, but to the words.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

SEVEN CENTURIES OF THE PROBLEM OF CHURCH AND STATE. By Frank Gavin. Princeton University Press, H. Milford. 9s.

The late Dr Gavin touched nothing that he did not adorn; but these four lectures, delivered at Princeton in 1937, can hardly be said to represent his genius at its highest power. As an introduction to this particular problem in the history of political thought, or as a survey and epitome of the literature of the subject, they have much indeed to recommend them: the arrangement is simple and the argument is clear; there are some novel and useful illustrations from the literature of the Orthodox Churches of the East; and, here and there, a welcome freshness of emphasis, as for example in the writer's insistence on the cardinal importance of Justinian not only for the East, but also for the West: " It has seemed to me rather astonishing that so little attention has been given to a scientific study of what he attempted to achieve and what ideals prompted his achievement." Moreover, the book exhibits a wide range of reading in various European languages, including Dutch and modern Greek, and the footnotes sparkle with erudition.

Yet it is difficult to remain unconscious that the author is not batting on his own wicket. For example, he regards it as " somewhat ironic " that King James I refused to sanction the publication of Bishop Overall's Convocation Book (1606), although it made directly for the theory of the Divine Right of Kings: he is evidently unaware that the reason why James repudiated it was that it decreed, in Canon XXVII, that a king *de facto* who was not *de jure* might be accepted; and that when Sancroft published it in the Nonjuring interest in 1690 it proved

a boomerang for the Nonjuring cause. Again, he devotes a disproportionate amount of space to the Anonymous of York on the assumption—which is Böhmer's—that all the tractates in that curious little volume were written by a single author. But no one who has worked directly on the manuscript (as Böhmer had not done) could possibly credit that assumption, which has, in fact, been finally exploded by the late Professor Philipp Funk in the *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft*, Vol. LV (1935), pp. 251-276 ("Der fragliche Anonymus von York").

It is, however, interesting to be assured that in the U.S.A. "the separation of Church and State is largely specious. While religion as such cannot in conjunction with the State exercise direct impact on social and political life, the disadvantage of the situation appears in times of national emergency when churches are expected to serve the interests of the common life in a further capacity than that of purely spiritual leadership"; and again, "It is perhaps a singular phenomenon, but one to which not enough attention has yet been given, that in the modern secular American university, attacks upon religion and its fundamental theses can be delivered and accepted by society without demur, and yet a vigorous defence—in anything like so able a fashion—of the root principle of religion immediately arouses opposition and antagonism. What would seem to one observer to be the case may be said in brief to be: modern secular education can attack religion while it allows no room for its defence. This is one of the many phases of the working out of the separation of Church and State, which on the whole allows no parity of authority, and no opportunity for the significance and importance of religion in the educational world. The State uses the Church, but the Church cannot use the State."

CHARLES SMYTH.

STUDIES IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By Archibald Allan Bowman. Edited with a Memorial Introduction by Norman Kemp-Smith. Macmillan. 2 vols. 30s.

Professor Kemp-Smith's preface tells us that the author of this work completed its first draft in 1924, continued to revise it up to the time of his death, and left no directions for its publication. It has been carefully edited and the chapters subdivided, but otherwise left in its original condition.

The work consists of four parts: a general introduction, an account of anthropological religion, the conception of religion, and the question of its validity. It is in the third and fourth that the interest really lies.

The author contends that while the non-religious man can

be genuinely moral, it is equally true that it is not possible to justify Morality except on a basis of Religion. Secular Morality either gets rid of the conception of obligation altogether, or else attempts to find a place for it on grounds compatible with naturalistic presuppositions. If Religion fails to differentiate itself from the natural life of man it is to that extent wanting in clearness of definition. The complete conception of Religion consists of the following factors. It begins and ends in the preoccupation with existence. It involves a progressive idealization of life—*i.e.*, what it means to be a person. It culminates in spiritual communion between the finite and the Divine. It implies the reality of the finite world. It postulates a Being to whom the finite subject can relate his personality as a whole. All these are realized in Christianity, which may therefore be described as a personalist interpretation of existence.

Here the author passes from the Concept to the Validity of Religion. This is certainly the most impressive portion of the whole work. The fundamental characteristic of this section is the analysis of selfhood, contrasted with subjective Idealism, in which paradoxically enough the subject is nothing and the object everything. If, as Hume held, the only kind of thing for which I have any theoretical right to claim existence is my observed states, then I should have to give up talking about *myself* and only speak of one experience knowing another. The author contends that Hume's argument is " only another example of the inveterate tendencies of empiricism to interpret all experience from the standpoint of phenomenalism." Upon what basis does our irresistible impression of self-identity rest? Upon what basis could it possibly rest but one of experience? Bowman argues that the Unity of the Self is confirmed by our conscious and our unconscious states and the transition from one to the other. An introverted view of life is implied in religion. It is urged that although our past is of actual experience while our future is a mere possibility, yet the unrealized possibilities of the future, obscure and problematical as they are, contribute no less surely than do the finalities of our past to the experience of the present. The introverted view of life is therefore defined as life regarded as an actual experience, in which the life that has been lived, and the life that is still to be, internalize themselves in the content of an ever-changing present. To this introverted view of life what Religion adds is the life eternal—which, of course, represents vastly more than endless prolongation of present existence.

Is the death of the body the end of life? Bowman replies that so far as the biological aspect is concerned it would be a thoroughly unwarrantable procedure to conclude that survival is even remotely probable. The existence of a body is one of the things which we experience when we experience what it

is to be alive. The body is the phenomenal or objective equivalent of life as subjectively experienced. If life persists the presumption is that it will be accompanied by some objective counterpart. This is precisely the Christian doctrine of a spiritual or resurrection body.

Now the problem of continued existence is concerned with persons. It would involve that personality has something in it which enables it not only to exist under conditions provided from without, but to supply the conditions of existence from its own internal resources. That is to say that a belief in immortality is a belief in selfhood and in the ontological possibilities bound up with the experience of what it is to be a self. The final problem therefore is the personality of God. This is a question of experience. The author holds that we have a right to believe in God's personal existence not as a logical deduction from given premises, but as the experience of what it is to be a person. "Man's practical belief in his own personality, and in his right to organize his life on a personal basis, implies, whether he knows it or not, the existence of a personal God."

As the editor says, it is obvious that the final chapter of the work would have been amplified had the author lived to supervise its publication. But it is a deeply impressive outcome of years of thought. A book to be read and read again, and one which will repay renewed reflection.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

The Open Way: A Study in Acceptance. By E. Graham Howe and L. le Mesurier. Methuen. 8s. 6d.

Dr Graham Howe is well known as a psychiatrist who has developed a very individual method of approach to his patients and their problems, and as a writer of a number of books marked by a striking and not always easy use of symbolism. His main thesis can be summed up very simply. He stresses the conception of balance, the necessity for seeing life as a movement between two extremes, like the swing of a pendulum. Each of these extremes stands for a necessary element in our mental and spiritual wholeness, and we neglect either of them at our peril.

In this book Mrs le Mesurier, herself an accomplished writer on sociology and economics, has collaborated with Dr Graham Howe, putting his conceptions into a form both readable and profound in their relevance to the life of men and of nations. It would not be exactly true to say that she has tried to popularize his theories; perhaps her book might rather be called an extended meditation upon them. At times, especially in her opening

chapter upon " the bodies of man " and her final chapter upon " the Cup," strongly symbolic language is used, in a manner familiar to readers of related psychological literature. The reader would be well advised to regard the symbolism as one might regard it in poetry or in dream-analysis, where, indeed, it has its place as a special mode of mental activity and expression. The correspondence, for example, of the four bodies, physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual, to earth, water, air, and fire, is only an analogy, and an analogy which (as happens regularly in dream-analysis) is of very different validity for different people.

But the use made of these analogies is practical and intelligible, and of very great importance. The message of the book can be summed up in a phrase: the " Open Way " is the way of acceptance, and acceptance must not be confused with acquiescence. We can never, in our own lives or in the life of the nations, solve any problem by denying it. We must accept what we are, and what others are, and so live and act in a real world. So, and so alone, can we be free to make any effective contribution to its progress. That, after all, is the Christian attitude to sin. To acknowledge our sin is the necessary condition of forgiveness, and forgiveness is positive and not negative, the way out into life.

This is the " technique of the Cup," as that into which all the experience of life of every kind is to be taken. So we get pacifism, but not passivity, a newness of life which denies nothing of that within which it comes to birth. The writers do not deny that there is a technique of the Sword as well, but the Cup comes first, and it is there alone that it can truly be said that " we live by faith."

The book has no particular orthodoxy, and points indeed to the dangers of orthodoxy as belonging to our " contracting " rather than to our " expanding " selves. That is why it should be a valuable exercise for orthodox readers. It has a special interest in its attempt to bring together the wisdom of the East and of the West. Probably the writers would themselves go further in the direction of accepting the thought-forms and even the mythology of the East than they have allowed to appear in this volume. Occasionally a sentence or two strike a note foreign to ordinary Christian thinking. " In the technique of the Cup, in the practice and habit of acceptance, the pattern of the soul is decided and destiny is shaped. It is this Karmic quality of soul which is individual, unique and continuous through the cycle of lives and deaths." A footnote calls attention to some of the problems which the conception of reincarnation involves, and it is clear that the writers would like to pursue the matter further. " We would only add our belief that the new metaphysic of time will make this difficult matter more clear. Obviously it is

not possible to understand reincarnation without understanding time."

But by far the greater part of the book is quite independent of these speculations and is full of shrewd and sane advice. It ought to do a great deal of good.

L. W. Grensted.

Finnagan's Wake. By James Joyce. Faber, 25s.

It is generally known that Mr James Joyce has been working upon his new novel for the past sixteen years. During that time it has probably been more discussed in literary circles than any book that has appeared in the English language since *The Dynasts*, and it may be the acute expectancy which all this aroused that has caused a certain disappointment. For I do not think it can be denied that Mr Joyce has progressed along the spiritual way that he began in *A Portrait of the Artist* and, achieving its peak in *Ulysses*, has here begun to descend—not through a decline of imaginative ability or creative power, but because the inability or refusal of the artist to see that all art is in some form a crystallization of life has resulted in a work that is a means rather than an end—an emotional and intellectual bridge rather than a base from which the mind can set out and to which it can return.

The very obscurity of Mr Joyce's technique is partly responsible for this. While there is no reason why a creative artist should not disclose the dream consciousness as a reality, he cannot possibly make it the *ultimate* reality without putting his whole world out of focus. For what is human consciousness but an ability to make a pattern of the universe? It is, I suppose, this ability that distinguishes the human mind from that of the beasts and the waking human mind from the sleeping human mind; but Mr Joyce's art carried to its logical conclusion (as it is in *Finnagan's Wake*) destroys this link with sanity. In the final chapter of *Ulysses* the effect was permissible because it was only an effect; but here it would seem to be something more.

"Evidentament he has failed as tiercely as the deuce before for she is wearing none of the three. And quite as patently there is a hole in the ballet trough which the rest fell out. Because to explain why the residue is, was, or will not be, according to the eighth axiom, proceeded with, namely, since ever apart that gosson duad, so sure as there's a patch on a pomelo, this yam ham in never live could, the drifting about of the lassies, the tug of love of their lads ending with a great deal of merriment, hoots, screams, scarf drill, cap fecking, ejaculations of aurinos, reechoable mirthpeals and general thumbtonosery, one must reckon with the sudden and gigantesquequesque appearance notwith-

standable as a general election in Barnado's bearskin amongst the brawlmiddle of this village childergarten of the largely long-suffering laird of Lucanhaf."

This treatment of a rowdy half-dream and half-nightmarish theme is permissible and can be excitingly effective. Here we are on the edge of individual consciousness and are being submerged in a crowd; but it does not follow that the same treatment should be meted out to the piercingly individual or mellow moments that distinguish the story in other places. For the book is rich in both; and that sense of guilt and of Man's fallen state which was such a poignant reality in *A Portrait of the Artist*, and made *Ulysses* into a spiritual Odyssey, is here as always the motive power of Mr James Joyces's finest emotional situations. The eye must indeed be blind that does not see in this author's lonely journeying a spiritual pilgrimage.

It must be said of *Finnagan's Wake*, however, that the journey is still in progress rather than that it has reached any final destination; and this applies more to its artistic than to its moral content. For, while it cannot be doubted that we have a book of importance to literary history and the growth of the English novel, I feel equally convinced that in it the author has not attained the peak. It is more likely to be regarded by posterity, like *Andronicus*, as a necessary experiment by the way that shall lead on to greater things.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

SERMONS. By Hugh Ross Mackintosh. T. and T. Clark. 7s.

Here are sermons by the author of the well-known work on the Person of Christ, eighteen of them, all orderly, fresh, illuminating and simple. Professor Mackintosh was not only a great theologian; he was also a man of unusual spiritual insight with a fine instinct for the right word and the lucid phrase. No theology in the technical sense of the word is obtruded in these sermons, but the theological background of them all is plain enough. Here is a passage from a very simple sermon on "He was called Jesus." "Salvation," he says, "is a word so rich and deep that it could not be confined in time. It applies to the past, yes, but to the present also, as when St Paul says that 'Jesus gave Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us from this present evil world.' And, finally, it extends its outlook and takes in the whole infinite future; as when we are told that Jesus is 'able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him'. A Saviour to the uttermost is a Saviour who saves right up to the very end. Jesus delivers from sin in every sense—from its penalty no doubt, but also from its practice; from its guilt, its tyranny, its stain, its awful power to exclude us from the fellowship of God."

In these sermons the reader will find new ideas on great truths like immortality (" men can live greatly if they know they are to live for ever "), on friendship, on fear, on missions, on temptation, on family worship; and when the ideas are not new the expression of them is always beautiful in its clearness as well as in its precision.

His friend Dr A. B. Macaulay has prefixed a memoir of the Professor in thirty-two pages, but it takes more than that to bring out the many sides of a strangely attractive personality which was a rich blend of humility and confidence, of gravity and humour, of sensitiveness and toleration; a full biography should have been written for nothing else if only for his letters.

W. PERRY.

ART EXHIBITION

ADAM. Jacob Epstein. The Leicester Galleries.

Nothing quite like Epstein's imaginative sculptures has been made in Europe during all the years since the birth of Christ, and, if for that reason only, they deserve serious consideration.

However, in pre-Christian days, similar work is to be found. For instance, Epstein's " Adam " may be compared with the statues found in the pyramid temples of the fourth dynasty in Egypt (such as those of " Kephron " and of " Ranofer " at present in the Cairo museum, but frequently illustrated)—statues which, incidentally, seem to have set the tradition of Egyptian art for the following 3,000 years. Thus " Adam " has the same large-scale and simplified modelling, the same thick-set legs stepping forward, the same formal positioning of the arms and fists, and even the same prolongation of the back of the head, which in Egypt was associated with kingship. Also there is the same expressionless face; but while the Egyptian significantly is staring forward, " Adam " looks vertically upwards.

On the other hand " Adam " has none of the almost inhuman dignity and austerity which characterize the Egyptian statues, and, in spite of all the above similarities, he remains the lumbering brute that Hebraism and Christianity know him partly to be. Thus the distortion of the hips, the squat and clumsy legs which seem to chain him to the ground, his somewhat indelicate nakedness, and the way in which the coarse, opaque body contrasts with the head which Epstein has cunningly fashioned from a translucent patch in the marble, all seem to emphasize " Adam's " human limitations.

It is interesting if Epstein is thus endeavouring to re-express some sort of a fusion between the spiritual and the material view of man, because it is this that Christianity achieves. But a comparison with the Christian view, as it is expressed, for in-

stance, in Maritain's new book on " true humanism," indicates that Epstein's fusion is Hebraic rather than Christian. Thus all his art seems sad, and suggests frustration rather than redemption (*e.g.*, Epstein's illustrations to Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du Mal*, exhibited last December). Again, Maritain's material view is concerned with humanistic idealism, as, for instance, represented in Marxism, while Epstein's material view is concerned with man's primitive instincts and his brute-like nature; but then, judging from present conditions in Europe, human idealism and human brutishness are hardly distinguishable in practice.

Perhaps " Adam " himself has felt this, because he has been bought for £7,000 and is to travel to Australia, which he no doubt hopes to find a slightly nearer approach to the Garden for which he was created than is the continent in which he now exists.

GILBERT N. WALTON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Rudolf Otto, *The Original Gītā* (15s.).

ASSOCIATION FOR PROMOTING RETREATS (36, Eccleston Square, S.W. 1) : *List of Retreats, June, 1939, to January, 1940* (7d. post free).

BLOUD ET GAY (PARIS): *Newman's Apologia* translated into French by L. Michelin Delimoges, with introduction and notes by Maurice Nédoncelle (n.p.).

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: W. Leonard, *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (12s. 6d.); R. Allers, *Self Improvement* (5s.); L. Nolle, O.S.B., *Sunday Instruction Notes* (6s.).

C.L.A.: A. Gurney, *A Picture at Florence* (4d.); M. Donavan, *Fasting Communion* (3d.); A. Chandler, *The Gifts of God and the Life of Man* (8d.).

INDUSTRIAL CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP: *The Church and Monetary Reform* (2d.).

KEGAN PAUL: E. Westermarck, *Christianity and Morals* (21s.).

MOWBRAYS: B. Hamilton Thompson, *Glastonbury. Truth and Fiction* (6d.).

FREDERICK MULLER: V. A. Demant, *The Religious Prospect* (7s. 6d.).

NICHOLSON AND WATSON: H. R. L. Slater, *God of the Living* (8s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Joseph B. Pike, *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers* (34s.).

P.P.B.: *Fifth Survey on the Affairs of the Continental Churches* (6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: K. Barth, *Church and State* (2s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. (MADRAS): *The Ceylon Liturgy* (n.p.).

VERLAG ERNST REINHARDT, MÜNCHEN: M. M. Ahmad, *Die Verwirklichung des Summum Bonum in der religiösen Erfahrung* (M.4.80).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher